

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WE have read with extraordinary pleasure and profit a little work by the Archbishop of YORK which embodies three lectures he gave under the Moody Foundation in the University of Chicago last winter. The book—or booklet, for it contains only ninety-four pages—is entitled *Christianity in Thought and Practice*, and is published by the S.C.M. at the low price of half a crown. For any minister and for many more than ministers it will be a half-crown well spent. For Dr. TEMPLE in the few pages at his disposal deals in his own lucid and suggestive way with some problems that are of pressing interest in our time.

The first two lectures are respectively headed the 'Relations between Philosophy and Religion' and 'Personality in Theology and Ethics.' Here, of course, we have an able discussion of topics which the learned writer has handled at length elsewhere and which have often enough been treated by a host of other writers. But Dr. TEMPLE in both deals not only with the large and general questions naturally involved, but with one that is certainly of common special interest and perhaps urgency in our time.

It is the problem of the individual in the State. In this political question theology is involved, and Dr. TEMPLE urges with earnestness that the political future of the peoples in our own and the next generation will depend on what answer is given to the questions, Is man an immortal

spirit? What kind of God, if any, may man seek fellowship with? If man is not immortal, then it follows that the Communist or Fascist view—for here they coincide—must be held proved; the individual has value only as a servant of the State, whose authority over him is unquestionable and indefeasible. If on the other hand man be immortal, destined for fellowship with God who is holy, righteous Love, then it is his relationship to the Will of God that is fundamental, then he has a claim against the State that it shall recognize this prior allegiance of his, then he may under certain circumstances rightfully disobey the State. The State is 'entitled to give directions to its citizens' and 'to implement these with appropriate sanctions'; but 'it is not at liberty in its pressure upon his mind and especially through the education which it provides, to suggest that he has no moral duty except to serve the State.'

It is the third lecture, however, on 'Christian Ethics in Application to Individuals and to Groups' that is most striking and, shall we say, most needed. Certainly it is most likely to provoke discussion. As to Christian Ethics in general, Dr. TEMPLE has something to say that some of our readers probably will not like. He maintains that it has almost become a tradition to say that the great contribution of Jesus to Ethics was the centrality of a principle of non-resistance. That belief, he holds, is a delusion, and 'if it is common it is common delusion.' True, in the Sermon on

the Mount non-resistance of a kind is inculcated, but what kind? The injuries or grievances specified concern only one person. But it is illegitimate to argue that Jesus meant non-interference when one sees a third party being injured. Aquinas held, and Dr. TEMPLE quotes him with approval, 'patiently to endure injuries done to oneself pertains to perfection; but patiently to endure injuries done to another pertains to imperfection and even to vice.' Jesus is not legislating but indicating a spirit by which we should live. 'Resentment is absolutely condemned, but not in all possible circumstances resistance.'

But of more pressing interest perhaps is the Archbishop's all too brief but pregnant treatment of a felt difficulty about Ethics. Many factors have conspired to make the question a living one in our time—Are the moral principles which ought to guide individuals those which ought to govern the relations of groups of men such as States? It is a question which has been little regarded in moral philosophy. In contrast to the Ethics applicable to the individual, which has been worked out in great detail and in which Christians are in a large measure of agreement, this group-morality has been oddly neglected. Some German writers have handled it, and in America Niebuhr has broken ground; but the philosophical treatment of this very real problem is only in its infancy.

On the one hand, we remember the Prussian publicists who before 1914 preached that the Sermon on the Mount has nothing to do with nations. On the other, since 1918 we have had many proclaiming, some of them quite violently, that the Sermon is as binding on groups as on individuals. And many are bewildered. Well, in his few pages Dr. TEMPLE cannot be expected to solve the problem. But he does contrive to say some things which need attention.

'What is morally wrong cannot be politically right' is regarded by many as an axiom. It is, Dr. TEMPLE holds, 'a deceptive saying true only in a sense which makes it irrelevant, and relevant only in a sense which is untrue.' If it means that

political actions should be directed to the highest conceivable good whether it be attainable or not, then it is a false principle as the outcome will be harmful not beneficial. It is foolish to impose on the mass of mankind a policy which has no root in their own wills. To say that the moral requirements for groups are the same as those for individuals is to ignore the extent to which a man's group-relations modify his individual situation and therefore his duty. A single man may feel called to personal sacrifices of a kind that a married man should not consider, and, if he be a father, would be wrong to contemplate. What right has he through his own splendid self-sacrifice to make life extremely hard for the innocent, passive infant?

Can one nation rightly be admonished to prefer the interests of other nations to its own as an individual may be taught to give place to others? As Dr. TEMPLE points out, there is no true analogy between the two cases. As individuals we may give way to one another, and surrender much to others, and all to the good; but is it quite the same situation as between nations? As members of a nation we are in the position of trustees; the national heritage of culture and all else is a solemn legacy from the achievement of the past. Not only so, but we have to consider those coming after us. And in our determining any policy we have to be loyal to those who went before and to those who come after. These are only two of the points dealt with in this suggestive, in part provocative, chapter. We may agree or disagree with Dr. TEMPLE, but he has at least shown that the problem of group-ethics is far more complex than has been commonly recognized.

So much has been written by and about Karl BARTH that all who are interested in theology must by this time be aware of the unique place he holds in the theological world of to-day. The sound of the alarm bell which, as he says, he accidentally rang has resounded throughout Christendom, and his writings have been as a sword dividing men and bringing sharply to decision. Many have

enthusiastically accepted his teaching; many have found it unintelligible or unpalatable.

It is not, however, too much to say that his latest book, *Credo* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), will lead to a better understanding and a new appreciation of him, at least in English-speaking circles. It is an exposition of the clauses of the Apostles' Creed as delivered in a course of lectures at the University of Utrecht, and it has been admirably translated.

Two qualities stand out conspicuously. The first is simplicity. BARTH'S style has lost much of its abruptness, and it does not abound to the same extent as formerly in paradox. The second quality is what can only be called his deadly earnestness. The sufferings through which the Evangelical Church in Germany has passed, and is still passing, have left their deep impress upon him. He is not to-day a dialectician, calmly discussing theological problems, he is a champion desperately fighting for the faith.

He finds that this desperate earnestness is not wholly welcome to his audience of Dutch students who share with all of us the tendency to play with theological questions rather than to be brought to the sharp edge of decision. 'All your questions betray to some extent that you are still able to pursue theology in *comfort*, with a certain calmness and detachment in regard to its problems, such as we once knew in Germany, but to-day know no longer. Here the delectable possibility is still yours of actually standing *over against* theological matters, of observing them, of having them approach in themselves. And now this Professor has blown in from Germany and with regard to many matters has said something very definite in a somewhat *binding* fashion, and you from your situation—that became very clear in your letters—are making a more or less cautious *defensive* movement. You would prefer that all questions, or as many as possible, should be left open. Though known as "head of the Dialectic Theology," I am not dialectic enough for you! . . . All this that has happened in Germany has been a challenge to the

Church and to theology, has been and is a challenge to each individual theologian to make a stand, to decide, to confess.'

It would be quite impossible here to attempt a summary of these lectures which are so compact in thought, so profound and heart-searching. Some notes, however, may be given on the first article of the Creed, the Christian doctrine of God. Many who have looked into the first volume of Karl BARTH'S *Dogmatics*—a truly monumental work if it be completed—have been surprised to find that after treating of the Word of God as the criterion of Dogmatics he plunges straight into the doctrine of the Trinity. He completely reverses what many would regard as the natural order, beginning abruptly at a point which theologians usually reach as the culmination of a long argument, and which some never reach at all.

Why is this? A study of the doctrine of God in BARTH'S *Credo* will make the reason plain. BARTH is insistent that the Creed, from its first article to its last, is written from a Christian standpoint, and that it is wholly based on the Christian facts. God is savingly known in Christ. There is a real and unique revelation in the Word, adequate for human need, and not to be modified or supplemented from other sources.

'God,' as spoken of in the opening words of the Creed, is not a being of whom the unbeliever has a certain knowledge which is enriched when he becomes a believer. To the unbeliever God is an 'unknown God' in the sense in which St. Paul used that expression at Athens, that is, in the sense that the truth about God is among men, made ineffective and unfruitful. 'The word "God" in the symbol, therefore, must not mislead us into first giving consideration to the nature and the attributes of a being which, on the basis of our most comprehensive experiences and deepest reflexion, we think we have discovered as that which this name may and must fit, in order thereupon, under the guidance of the historical statements of the symbol, to ascribe to the subject so conceived this and that definite predicate, behaviour and act.

On the contrary, we have to begin with the admission that of ourselves we do *not* know what we say when we say "God," *i.e.* that all that we think we know when we say "God" does not reach and comprehend Him who is called "God" in the symbol, but always one of our self-conceived and self-made idols, whether it is "spirit" or "nature," "fate," or "idea" that we really have in view. . . . Only God's revelation, not our reason despairing of itself, can carry us over from God's incomprehensibility. In telling us that God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the symbol, which speaks of God on the basis and in the sense of the prophetic-apostolic witness, expresses absolutely for the first and only time *Who* God is and *What* God is.'

The designations of God as 'the Father Almighty' and 'the Creator of heaven and earth' are to be interpreted in the same way. Here is no 'play-ground for Natural Theology.' We do not take our imperfect conceptions of fatherhood and make a transference of them to God, but on the contrary God is revealed as essentially and eternally Father, and is the ground and incomparable prototype of all human creaturely fatherhood. In like manner His omnipotence is not to be understood from any philosophical idea of infinite potentiality. 'But the omnipotence of the Father, revealed in the revelation of His Son through the Holy Spirit, is (in the obedience and faith given to the revelation) a reality which can be recognized as the totality of all known and conceivable and unknown possibilities. For the Lord over life and death with Whom we have here to do is as such the Lord of our existence, *i.e.* He to Whom our life and with it our death has become bound, He Who at the utmost limit of all our possibilities commands us: Halt! and at the very same place and instant: Forward! to Whom therefore we effectively *belong*, *i.e.* in extremest fear and in greatest hope. That is "omnipotence" in a serious sense of the word.'

The doctrine of Creation has nothing to do with a 'world-view,' nor is it part of a general science that has got to be crowned and completed by Christian knowledge. 'If man looks at the world generally and from out of himself, and thinks he

knows something of its origin, and if he perhaps decides to name this origin "God," he must yet turn round again and become as a child in order to hear and comprehend what the symbol in common with Holy Scripture says: Creator of heaven and earth.' The doctrine says not only that we absolutely belong to God, but that without Him we should not be and that we exist only through Him. Because God is the Creator of the world it stands under His sovereignty, while it presents a certain mode of the existence of God to His creature. 'Therefore in the proposition, "God is the Creator," we recognize not only God's transcendence, but also the immanence of that God so completely transcendent to the world. Remembering the Creator's transcendence, we shall be safeguarded against ascribing to the world as such any divinity whether imparted to it by God or belonging to itself independently. This very same recollection of the Creator's transcendence will, however, also warn us against denying God's co-existence with the world and therefore His immanence, *i.e.* His free omnipotent presence and lordship in the world that He created.'

The doctrine of Creation, however, has its definite limits. There is the problem of evil. It is impossible to ascribe its existence to the Creator, equally impossible to deny His omnipotence by assuming an anti-God. 'In order to keep true to the facts, Dogmatics has here, as in other places, to be logically inconsequent. Therefore in spite of the omnipotence of God—or rather on the score of the rightly understood omnipotence of God, Dogmatics must not at this place carry the Creation-thought right to the end of the line.' Our logic is brought to a halt before the *mysterium iniquitatis*.

Similarly, the immanence of God would seem to exclude a special presence of God such as we associate with miracle, prayer, and the Church. But our logic must give way to the gospel facts. For 'if we did not know about the immanence, once and for all and in an altogether special sense, of the Word of God in the flesh, how would and could we dare, in despite of sin, evil, death, and devil, to

believe in a general immanence of God in the world, and to live ?'

The new issue of *The Modern Churchman* contains the addresses given at the Twenty-third Annual Conference held at Oxford in August. The President was Dr. W. R. Matthews, who spoke on 'The Rights of Reason in Religion,' and Dr. Inge read a paper on 'Prayer.' The general theme was 'What to Believe,' which brought the members of the Conference right up against the Christian facts. As a consequence, the papers on this occasion seem more positive than usual. There even appears a tendency in the contributions to move slightly to the right. Perhaps the most interesting and valuable paper read was on 'The Significance of Jesus for Faith,' by the Rev. R. D. RICHARDSON, M.A., B.Litt. As this takes us to the heart of things, we give a brief summary of it.

The writer raises, and answers, certain crucial questions. First: Can the records that we have of Jesus compel faith for those who have no faith? The answer is No. Where faith is not intuitive; or where the lives and teaching of those we know have not awakened it; or where joy or sorrow have not re-made us within, the records we have of Jesus cannot *create* faith. But, secondly, can they create faith in us if our scale of values is already right? The answer is Yes. Because there is a background in our lives, a great and ever-growing volume of experience which is all of a piece with the records.

Thirdly, should faith in Jesus comprehend the whole of the Christian's faith? No. He was not such for the faith of the first disciples, whose faith was fixed on *God*, a spiritual being without visible representation. And our Christianity has always been a faith in God. We believe that God is revealed in Jesus, but orthodox Christianity has never believed that Jesus exhausts God. He is the mighty river, but God is the wide, wide ocean.

Fourthly, do we know enough about Jesus for Him to be truly significant for our faith here and

now in this twentieth century? 'To this question the answer is emphatically Yes.' It is true that the Gospels contain elements of interpretation. Everywhere in the New Testament historical elements are held in solution by active elements of faith, though not of faith as opposed to fact. In this matter 'Form-Criticism' has been a helpful discipline. For it has shown, for example, how in Mark, both in its main lines and in its colouring, history is not hidden from us; and that, quite certainly, in the most primitive short paragraphs we get very near to the living, speaking voice of Jesus.

Moreover, the New Testament portrait of Jesus is multiple, and each aspect of it complementary to the others. Truth is a jewel of many facets, and it is our joy to see several facets of this shining together, to the increased splendour of each. The significance of the portrait, then, is to be found in its wholeness, in the perfect round, in the balance that it presents, even of contrasting elements. We must not analyse the Gospels to find the irreducible minimum of bare history. The real truth lies in the Figure that emerges when we combine the features into a unity.

We come, then, to the essence of the question: What is the significance of Jesus for faith? It is twofold. First, there is the religious consciousness of Jesus Himself. Secondly, there are the interpretations which His Christians have given of Him. First, then, 'the mind of Christ,' the study of which is best described as the study of an overwhelming religious experience. We shall be most illuminated if we look not so much for things either new or old in what He says and does, but for things which bear the stamp of an unrivalled, immediate knowledge of God. His faith is a completely unreserved trust, dazzling, daring, deliberate, which knows no defeat. And yet it is based on fact. He knows, through prayer, the God of whom He speaks.

'He appears to have neglected all cult and ceremony; set forth no forms of faith; made no religious profession. A Sovereign Freedom reigns

over all His words and actions ; a Sovereign Truth ; a Sovereign Love.' There is nothing shifting, or fitful or merely changeful about Him, but everywhere, says Von Hügel, there are 'energy and expansion, thought and emotion, effort and experience ; joy and sorrow, loneliness and conflict, interior trial and triumph, exterior defeat and supplantation : particular affections, particular humiliations : homely labour, a homely heroism, greatness throughout in littleness. And in Him, for the first and last time, we find an insight so unique, a Personality so strong and supreme, as to teach us, once for all, the true attitude to suffering.'

But in addition to the religious consciousness of Jesus Himself, there are the interpretations of Him given by His disciples. To begin with, St. Paul in First Corinthians gives us a statement of beliefs which were the substance of the Apostolic preaching not more than seven years after the Crucifixion. It contains the following points: The prophecies fulfilled and the New Age come through Jesus : born of the seed of David : died according to the Scriptures : buried : rose on the third day : seen of Cephas : exalted at the right hand of God : He will come to be our Judge.

This Apostolic theme is filled out by the New Testament as a whole. The Gospels do this by dwelling on the earthly life of Jesus. But in their final form the Gospels have become a creed, an interpretation, and they represent Jesus as a Divine Being, moving across the stage of history and performing suitable miracles, while all that He says and does is completely known to, and planned by, God ; whence follows the simplicity and majesty of the narrative, free from a single adjective, I believe, in the heart-rending story of the Passion ('Jesus wiped away the adjectives from men's lips,' says Glover). One gets a sense of 'God over all.' And this has its own value for us in estimating the significance of Jesus for faith. The writers felt that, in Jesus, 'God had visited and redeemed His people.'

Then St. Paul's interpretation. The new age

which has dawned is the age of the long-promised gift of the Spirit ; and it has proved to be the Spirit of Jesus, which since His resurrection has entered mightily into this world of 'Law' and sin and created a new Fellowship, righteous, holy, glorious, immortal. The Apostolic band has become a Spirit-bearing Church. Thus there are two foci in the New Testament, the personality of Jesus and the activity of the Holy Spirit ; but yet again these two are one.

The writer sums up briefly the 'interpretations' in Hebrews and John. And then he comes to the question : What is the significance of Jesus for faith *to-day* ? His answer is 'essentially I think it is the same as in the past.' He would say that God entered history at last decisively in Jesus Christ except that he does not like the word 'entered.' It savours too much of a view of a world into which God comes only from without. We now think of the universe as being the result of a continuous process in which God emerges continuously. Yet the fact remains that there are at times fuller emergences into history of the Divine Spirit, and that Jesus is a decisive revelation of the character and will of God.

Human thought may circle round Him, as the Bishop of Birmingham says, but it does not go past Him. 'It is unfortunate that the word Incarnation is historically associated with the idea of a miraculous conception ; but, despoiled of that element, it alone conveys the essential thought of the uniqueness of Jesus. Again, we modern Christians see the same significance in Jesus as led our forefathers to speak of Him as the God-man and to formulate the doctrine of the Trinity. Let it suffice then for me to say that here was One who was truly man ; who was able so to live and talk, and be "to the Eternal Goodness what his right hand is to a man," . . . as that His life presents a series of Epiphanies—glorious unveilings of God.'

Thus is established in Jesus the kinship of God and man. But this does not mean that the world has no need of redemption. Jesus is the Brother

of all men, but He is also their Lord. His nature and ours are of the same stuff, but He is the diamond, we are the charcoal. The holiest of His disciples are those most conscious of their need of forgiveness. And it is to Him that we go that we may be

kindled and purified, and may feel the power of God's forgiveness. 'Thus, the significance of Jesus for faith is such that our attitude to Him determines whether we enter the Kingdom of God and inherit its blessings or not.'

The Present Situation of Theology in Germany.¹

I.

BY PROFESSOR KARL HEIM, D.D., PH.D., TÜBINGEN UNIVERSITY.

IF I am going to speak about the present situation in German theology, I am afraid I cannot report new masterpieces of creative thought or the emergence of world-stirring ideas. The waves of the political movement are still too high for that. The monastic quietness of the secluded study, in which the great theologians thought out their systems, is missing. I can only speak of foundations that have been shaken, and of one or two attempts to begin building again.

My remarks may be brought under three heads: 1. The decline of Liberalism in all its forms. 2. The crisis of the Theology of Crisis. 3. The call to return to the sources, that is, to the Bible and to Christ Himself.

Until the end of the nineteenth century, indeed up to the end of the Great War, German theology followed three lines of development. It had three starting-points. The first was the philosophy of Kant, which asserted that man was free and morally autonomous. This philosophy was carried over into a theological system by Albrecht Ritschl and his famous disciples. The central idea of the Ritschlian theology was the idea of the Kingdom of God, which Jesus founded, as a Kingdom of autonomous individuals who know that God is not a Judge, but the Father of all mankind. In my student days, forty years ago, we used to divide up our divinity students into two classes, those who could understand Ritschl, and those who could not, and probably never would understand him. This theology exercised a great influence in the past; and even to-day there are not a few important Ritschlian theologians in Germany. But this theology is now a thing of the past. What is the

reason for this? Paul Tillich remarks in one of his books. 'The modern man is an autonomous man, but an autonomous man whose belief in his own autonomy is shaken.' No theology adequate to the present generation can be erected upon the autonomy of the individual. The age of individualism is past.

The second starting-point of pre-war German theology was the speculative theology of Hegel and David Friedrich Strauss, both of whom were students in the Tübingen Theological Seminary. The basis of this theology was the abstract idea of the identity of the infinite with the finite. A timeless idea, a Christ-principle, was put in the place of the historical person of Jesus. Strauss, under Hegel's influence, could affirm that 'the idea cannot bear to see its riches lavished upon the individual.' The idea of salvation, by means of which the whole of humanity accomplishes its own deliverance, is then substituted for the Saviour who appeared at a specific, never-to-be-repeated point in history. This theology had an amazing influence during the second half of the nineteenth century. This influence was strengthened and enlarged by the alliance between speculative theology and the Higher Criticism, which had destroyed the traditional picture of our Lord and left in its stead a mere myth. This speculative idealism, like the Ritschlian theology, belongs to the past. The generation which fought in the War could not and cannot live by abstract ideas. It has learnt to look the facts squarely in the face, however cruel or disturbing they may seem to be. I have still very vivid memories of the students who came back to my lecture-room, straight from the trenches. For them the light of all ideas and

¹ A lecture given in Edinburgh, July 2nd, 1936.

ideals had grown dim—such as the idea of world-progress or the conception of a moral order. The fact that the cultured peoples of Europe had mangled one another for four long years had robbed them of the faith that the Ideal has significance for the real world. One could hear the remark—‘The God we used to believe in fell in the War.’

A third starting-point of pre-war German theology was religious experience. This theology arose through Schleiermacher’s attempt to read off every dogmatic utterance about God, Christ, and the Church from religious feeling, just as one reads off the chemical composition of a star from the spectrum produced when its light is passed through a glass prism. Frank in Erlangen sought, by a similar process of spectral analysis, to read off the whole substance of the Gospel (*Heilsgeschichte*) from the consciousness of the ‘twice-born.’ This basing of religious conviction upon inward experience led psychological observation to the study of religious experience itself. Stimulated by James, whose books were translated into German by Wobbermin, there flourished in Germany a considerable literature on the psychology of religion. Otto wrote his much read book, *The Idea of the Holy*, which was translated into the language of all cultured peoples. The high tide of interest in the psychology of religion, however, has already ebbed. The reason for this is precisely the same as that for the waning influence of great ideas. The catastrophe of the Great War brought with it, among other things, a depreciation of all feelings of awe and reverence, of all warm, pulsing sensations of the human heart. The hard law of the pitiless struggle for existence, whose inexorable sway had made itself only too powerfully felt, acted upon the delicate blossoms of religious feeling like a sudden, spring frost. Beneath the icy breath of bitter reality, they withered and died.

I have spoken of the decline of Liberalism in its chief forms, a decline which was, in the main, a result of the War. It was against such a background as this, and because of it that there arose during the post-war period another kind of theology—the Theology of Crisis. This theology was the child of post-war depression. During these years the theology of Barth and Brunner drove all other systems, the conservative as well as the liberal, from the field. This type of theology seemed then, and still seems to many, to have the word which matches the hour. Barth has never been so famous as he is now. His name is known to all in Great Britain who take a vital interest in the movements within modern theological thought. In Japan,

not so long ago, Barth’s books were best-sellers among religious literature. The first question reporters often put to me when I was in America last year was, ‘What is the matter with Barth?’ Nevertheless, we must say that, as far as Germany is concerned, the day of the Theology of Crisis, at least, in its earlier forms (such as Barth’s *Epistle to the Romans*) is past. Barth’s theology was a necessary corrective; and there is not one of us who has not learnt a very great deal from him. During the period which followed the War, a period in which all values were challenged and shaken, this theology was of great significance. Two figures are characteristic of these years—Oswald Spengler and Karl Barth. Spengler gave its most radical expression to the relativist attitude of the time when he said in his *Decline of the West*, ‘We are living in the Autumn of the Faustian culture.’ The chief indication of decline, he pointed out, is the absence of any characteristic style in art. We are unable to create a new culture. Barth used this relativist attitude as a means to a new discovery of the absolute. Let me express what I mean by a simple illustration. The Swiss theologian made the Tell’s Leap. With the waves on every side threatening to engulf the boat, Barth took advantage of the very wave which seemed likely to hurl the boat to destruction, in order to jump on to the solid rock of transcendent reality. Thus the crisis of the theology of experience became the way which led to a rebirth of the theology of the Reformation.

Since then, however, the whole situation has changed. The sceptical mood of decline was not, as many thought, the consummation which spelt the death of culture. On the contrary, the pessimistic and relativistic mood of the post-war period was a stage of transition to something new, which had been in process of preparation for some time. Now, like a fire that had long been smouldering under the ashes, it burst into flame. The vitality of the German nation, which had never really been broken, reacted with great vigour against the weary and hopeless attitude, the sceptical mood of decline, which prevailed after the socialistic revolution of 1918.

What was this new thing that came with the birth of Nationalism, considered from the standpoint of a world-view? Nietzsche saw more deeply than Spengler into the meaning of history, when he said: ‘The significant thing in coming centuries—and I am looking forward to it with ever-increasing excitement—will be the emergence of European Nihilism. By Nihilism I do not

mean despairing, life-denying, pessimistic Nihilism, but joyful, world-affirming Nihilism.' The world, according to Nietzsche, is an inexhaustible stream of life and power eternally flowing back upon itself. On such a view as this the Biblical idea of Creation or of the Creator is not only wrong: it is, like the notion of the end of the world, a concept that simply cannot be framed. This world-affirming Nihilism, for which God and a world beyond are logically impossible concepts, is a very widespread attitude in our modern technical age. It is gaining influence every day among civilized nations. It was asserted by the leading missionaries who took part in the International Missionary Conference at Jerusalem in 1928, that this modern secularism, which is gaining ground everywhere, is a much more serious obstacle to missionary enterprise than all the high, non-Christian religions, such as Brahmanism, Buddhism, or Islam, with which missionaries have hitherto had to deal. This life-affirming Nihilism is the background of the two movements which are to-day contending with one another for the soul of our generation—Bolshevism and Nationalism, in so far as the latter denies the existence of the Beyond. I am not speaking of Nationalism as a political movement, but of Nationalism as a world-view, which has sprung up in recent years not only in Germany, but in other parts of the world. Under the influence and leadership of Gandhi, for instance, an Indian faith has arisen, a faith in the divine value and universal mission of the Indian people. On the basis of this faith the effort has been made not only to overcome caste distinctions, but also to bridge the gulf between the old international religions which fought for the soul of India: Brahmanism and Islam. Turkey is to-day far more Turkish than Moslem. Her leaders are striving, by eradicating the Arab strain from the language, and by rewriting Turkish history, to minimize the place of Islamic heritage in Turkey, and to magnify the Turkish race, to which Islam is but an incident in a long career. Persia is nationalistic, Iraq is nationalistic. Copts join with the Moslem majority in Egyptian nationalism. Even the black race has wakened from its slumber and has begun to feel itself a racial unity. The symbols of this modern attitude to life are the statue of Italia, with Mussolini kneeling in devotion before it, and the flame that burns continually before the grave of the Unknown Warrior under the Arc de Triomphe in Paris. Both of these symbolize the deification of the nation-state.

Bolshevism on the one hand, secularist Nationalism on the other—these are the two main forms

of that joyous, world-affirming Nihilism, which Nietzsche saw as the future faith of Europe. Nietzsche was not enough of a prophet to be able to predict the emergence of these two movements, or to say what specific form they might assume; but he certainly divined the direction they are now taking.

If we are to proclaim the Christian message to our age, we must be prepared to answer the two questions which the modern man asks as soon as he begins to take the message seriously. The first question raises a philosophical problem. The secularist who does not belong to any Church (and the number of such in America, for instance, is estimated at 60 per cent.) puts to us the question, 'Has the term "other-world" any meaning for the world-view of the present?' The fact that Space, as we now know, is infinite makes the whole distinction between this world and a world beyond appear meaningless. Reality has become a limitless, shoreless ocean of power and life. Even the Barthian thesis of 'the infinite, qualitative distinction between time and eternity,' between this world and the world beyond, fails to make any impression upon a modern secularist. Seventy years ago, Ludwig Feuerbach, one of the greatest of secularist thinkers, gave a very acute psychological analysis of Luther's faith in the sole causality of God and man's total inability to achieve his own salvation. To one who stands outside the stream of Christian experience there is something almost seductive about Feuerbach's explanation. This glorifying of God and robbing man of his worth is, according to him, only another form of man's projection of his needs and hopes into the deep blue sky. In the first form, man projects his idealized self into the clouds. In the second sublimated form he empties himself and projects his ideal into the heavens. He himself is nothing, the projected ideal is everything. If Feuerbach were living to-day, he would analyse Barth in precisely the same fashion. We can see, then, that the modern secularist, when he hears the message of God's transcendence, even in Barth's form, will only ask more insistently than ever, 'Has the idea of transcendence any meaning for our modern way of looking at the world? Since the Universe can no longer be divided into two storeys—for we have come to believe that it is infinite—can the notion of a supersensual, supernatural Reality be anything else than a projection into the sky of human desires or subconscious complexes?'

The second question that the man of to-day wants to ask as he listens to the Christian message is not

a philosophical but a very simple and practical question. He asks, 'If there is a revelation of a world beyond, has it any power to change the world in which we live?' Those are the two burning questions which, in the present state of affairs, are asked of theology. I should like to point out that dialectic theology, which we have to thank for so much, leaves us wanting an answer to both questions and that for this reason it was necessary to seek other ways. Let us consider the *first* question: the problem of the transcendental as it is formulated by modern secularism. Dialectic theology deals with it as if it were an unimportant preliminary question of no importance to theology. Barth's pamphlet entitled 'No,' in reply to Brunner's little book *Nature and Grace*, is characteristic of his whole attitude to the questions raised by the philosophy of religion. Brunner's book raised anew the old question which all philosophy of religion asks—If God is a reality, what is the relation between the omnipresent and all-creating power of the Almighty God and the responsible will of man? Looking more deeply into the matter we see that behind this question lies the last question which the modern man asks: is it in any way possible to speak of an absolute power? Such power alone must be effective. Nothing could take place without it. With it there can be no decisions of human will. The ultimate problem must then be considered; in what relation does the absolute power of God stand to the will of a relative being. As yet it is not possible to consider the special problem of whether the Roman Catholic or the Protestant way to salvation is the truer. There is a problem which precedes all discussion of predestination and synergism, or of the differences between the two churches. Brunner's solution is

fairly simple. He says: our eternal fate is wholly God's work. I live entirely by the grace of God, but still I possess, as a creature of God, two capacities, which in the terms of orthodox dogmatics would be the two indestructible remnants of the image of God, namely, that I am able to hear God's word, and that I have the consciousness of responsibility.

That Barth refused to agree with Brunner's solution did not astonish me, but the way in which he did so. Barth does not hear the question asked by the man of to-day who is absolutely disinterested in confessional discussions; who only questions the whole meaning of transcendence. Barth does not take the question seriously. For Barth there exists only one question; he reduces all problems violently and arbitrarily to the one, namely, that of the reformers who asked whether justification was by deeds or faith alone. For him every philosophical objection must be a hidden or masked form of righteousness by works. He, therefore, does not pay attention to Brunner's question and explanation. Brunner has ascribed to the human ego a rôle in the journey along the path to salvation. Barth blindly attacks this heresy with fanatical rage.

The way in which Barth argued has proved to me that he is an excellent critic of the Christian Church, an incomparable critic of that group, or in his own words 'a corrective,' 'a pinch of cinnamon.' But he is not a missionary who understands the attitude of the modern secularists. We expect no help from him in the solution of the problem of transcendence. He can appeal only to the believing congregation, and is unable to move the unbeliever. He is not an effective leader in the Church's conflict with the world of unbelief.

(To be continued.)

Literature.

FAITH AND SCIENCE.

THE bearings of current scientific theory on the Christian view of God, man, and the world is a subject that needs re-examination for almost every generation. There are two weaknesses to which the minister is prone who in the pulpit or in the Bible Class deals with this topic or series of topics.

One is to speak without sufficiently clear knowledge or understanding of what current scientific theory really is; the other is to surrender, in a desire to be abreast of the times in his theology, whatever a perhaps baseless assertion of some reputed scientific authority represents as untenable. Hence there is need in every successive age for the work of some who have competent understanding both of current

science and of theology to show just what, if any, the bearing of the former on the latter may be.

We have before us one such book as we desiderate in *Christian Faith and the Science of To-day*, by the Rev. J. H. Morrison, M.A. (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). We congratulate Mr. Morrison, a valued contributor to our columns, on his appointment to deliver the Cunningham Lectures last winter, and on their appearance in expanded form in this volume. It is written throughout with that lucidity and sparkling style which we expect from the author; some very abstruse questions are handled, but there is not a paragraph which the ordinary reader will fail to understand.

In his first chapters Mr. Morrison deals with the sub-microscopical and the ultra-telescopic universe. Here the achievements of modern scientific research have been amazing, and a tremendous revolution of thought, perhaps chiefly in the former sphere, has been wrought. Readers will find sure guidance as to present-day conceptions—and conceptions is the right word—of the structure of matter and of the universe. He will gain some truer notion of what the ‘blessed’ words ‘relativity’ and ‘indeterminacy’ mean, and will be warned of the risk of so misunderstanding the latter as to believe that ‘Nature is loose-jointed.’ The bearing of scientific theory as to ‘matter’ and ‘law’ just is that the thought-background is vastly more favourable to a spiritual view or interpretation of Nature than was the rigid mechanistic view of some years ago.

In ‘Nature and Supernature’ we are given a suggestive and satisfying ‘apologetic’ for Providence, miracle, and inferentially prayer. Then in a very fine chapter on ‘Evolution’ we learn how the latest science is far less dogmatic and certain of itself than the older scientists were. This leads naturally to a discussion of the ‘Ascent and Fall of Man.’ In our opinion this is one of the best sections in a book which is all good.

Finally, in ‘Scientist and Christian’ Mr. Morrison argues persuasively for the supreme importance for Christian Faith of the Revelation in Jesus Christ. The testimonies of some modern scientists have their value; but they no more than the beautiful thoughts of the believing poets can afford a sure basis for faith in the love of God. ‘That faith can be confidently built only on the basis of the historical revelation given in Jesus Christ.’ ‘Science cannot help us here, and it is a mistake to look for help in that direction, or greedily, as some do,

to snatch up the crumbs which fall from the scientist’s table.’

PROFESSOR PATON ON KANT.

While the so-called ‘Scottish’ Philosophy has more direct relations with France than with Germany, it is surely striking that so many of our Scottish Professors of Philosophy have made notable contributions to literature expository of Kant. In the early eighties of last century we had Hutchison Stirling, and in the late ‘eighties Edward Caird, thirty years later Professor Kemp Smith, and now Professor H. J. Paton of Glasgow University.

Professor Paton’s work is entitled *Kant’s Metaphysic of Experience: A Commentary on the First Half of the ‘Kritik der reinen Vernunft’* (Allen & Unwin; 2 vols., 30s. net the set). Let us state baldly and boldly that this is a work which no student of Kant can be without. There is a forbidding mass of literature on Kant, some of it good, some of it an almost complete misunderstanding of the master. Some criticisms of Kant have been so often repeated that they have almost acquired unquestionable authority. It is one of the great merits of this work that it goes back directly to Kant himself. Professor Paton finds Kant to be his own best interpreter. In this way it appears that some of the familiar criticisms of Kant are perfectly baseless, and to Professor Paton it appears that Kant’s doctrine contains far more truth than is commonly believed, and, as he suspects, more truth than many modern philosophies. The work is professedly a commentary, but there are commentaries and commentaries. This one reads connectedly like an independent work. The student will do well to have a text at hand, not to discover what the commentary is dealing with sentence by sentence, but only to see if he can agree with Professor Paton’s interpretation.

The main criticisms of Kant which the book shows to be baseless are that which asserts the *Kritik* to be a patchwork of fragments very loosely thrown together, so that in Professor Kemp Smith’s words, ‘Kant flatly contradicts himself in almost every chapter,’ and that Kant followed very uncritically the traditional schematism of formal logic and spun the Categories out of nothing to fit into it. Professor Paton is not prepared to justify everything that Kant said; when he differs from, or fails to understand, Kant he frankly tells us; but he is surely right in holding that one who finds Kant quite unintelligible has no business to attempt to expound him.

The work is written in charming literary style. Altogether it is a noble contribution to our national philosophical literature, and we have no doubt will enhance the credit of British philosophy abroad.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE—THREE DISTINCT PERIODS.

The Apostolic Age and the New Testament (Milford; 7s. net) is composed of the Bohlen Lectures for 1935. The author is that distinguished veteran among Biblical scholars, Professor George A. Barton, Ph.D., S.T.D., LL.D., now of the Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. His purpose in these pages is to give an outline of the formative ideas and influences of the Apostolic Age, and their effect upon the New Testament books produced in it; an outline, moreover, that shall be sufficiently brief and clear to be understood by the layman and non-technical scholar. Dr. Barton has succeeded well in his purpose, and his expositions have the additional merit of being up to date.

The scheme of contents is largely determined by the author's tripartite division of the history of the Apostolic Age. The first of the three periods begins with the Day of Pentecost (A.D. 30) and extends to the commencement of St. Paul's mission in Antioch (A.D. 42 or 43). During this period the Church was groping for its mission. The effort of its leaders was to convince Jews that Jesus was the Messiah, and the net result of their labours was to establish Christianity as a small Jewish sect.

The second period begins at A.D. 42 or 43 and ends with St. Paul's death (A.D. 64), or, more conveniently, with the destruction of Jerusalem (A.D. 70). It was the period of the beginning of conscious missionary enterprise, and was characterized by fierce controversy between the particularists, who virtually looked upon Christianity as a Jewish sect, and the universalists, who interpreted Christianity as a religion for all the world. The result was the spread of Christianity through Asia Minor, around the Ægean, to the islands of the Mediterranean, to Rome, and, perhaps, to Alexandria.

The third period begins at A.D. 70 and closes with the composition of the last book of the Canon about A.D. 150. It was the period of the institutionalizing of Christianity. 'During this period Christians had to face the problems created by syncretistic thought in the form of gnosticism, open opposition of the Jews, the insidious competition

of the mystery religions, and, because no longer a Jewish sect, the persecution visited upon an illegal religion by Roman government.'

Each of these periods, as Dr. Barton maintains, left its mark on the literature or traditions produced in it, and thus the recognition of them becomes 'a helpful instrument of criticism.' He adds that it is difficult to see how, unless Christianity had been institutionalized, it could have survived to this day. Sometimes, no doubt, the Church has had a baneful effect upon social and individual life. 'On the other hand, an institution that conserves the best aspiration and teaching that the past has achieved, fosters high aspiration, ethical endeavour, and personal consecration in the present, and helps to keep the mind open to the leading of the Spirit into new fields of thought, of service, and of sacrifice for the future, is indispensable to the best life of man.'

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS:· SOURCES AND MESSAGE.

Dr. V. Burch, who was for a time Cathedral Lecturer in Divinity at Liverpool, has made a suggestive contribution to the study of *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Williams & Norgate; 5s. net). His two main conclusions are, that the Epistle is throughout Hebrew in ideas, being uninfluenced by Alexandrine Judaism; and that its aim and purpose is to confirm the faith of Hebrew Christians inclined to yield to the spell of the 'silent voices of the dead' and 'the lowland ways behind.' He would name the Epistle 'A Letter against the Lure of the Lowland Ways,' and he describes it as 'a triumph of the highest order of craftsmanship.' The author, who had been schooled in the ancient Semitic world and in the new world of Jesus Christ, must have been a man of the type of Barnabas; and he wrote the Epistle, it is more specifically concluded, to those in Antioch who, in the period near to the destruction of the Temple, were turning themselves to the wizardry of the 'silent voices' and 'the lowland ways' (Dr. Burch never lets these metaphors go).

We must leave it to experts to examine Dr. Burch's work in detail. His judgments are often provocative and may not always be truly founded, but he displays in this book an uncommon power of subtle and searching analysis and a mastery of the expositor's art. The book would have gained much had it presented, if only in summary form, a detailed statement of conclusions reached with regard to the sources of the Epistle.

DALE LECTURES.

Man and Revelation (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net), by Professor Günther Dehn, late of Halle, consists of the Dale Lectures given at Mansfield College, Oxford, in 1935. There are eight lectures in all, and in them the author deals with certain questions of Christian thought and life, 'not as a free scholar but as a theologian bound by the Church.' What he means by this phrase is not altogether clear. In the lectures there are things both old and new. What is new in them is chiefly the affirmation of Reformation principles on the lines of the teaching of Karl Barth. Thus they support Barth as against 'his one-time theological friend' Emil Brunner on the question of the image of God in man after the Fall. Even after Adam's fall, says Brunner, man is still a responsible being endowed with reason and, accordingly, with the faculty of accepting revelation. But Barth will have none of this, and Dr. Dehn says that without doubt Barth is right: 'Any assertion of an existing affinity between man and God is a denial of the principal concern of Scripture, namely, that God's honour should truly be given Him.' 'In faith,' he adds, 'man is once more the image of God, as Adam was in Paradise; without faith, he stands in darkness and in death.'

The theological reader, acquainted with the present-day Lutheran emphasis in Continental dogmatics, will know the kind of teaching to expect when he turns to the other subjects treated in this volume, such as Justification by Faith, the Word of God, the Church, the Hidden God.

The author of *Christianity in America: A Crisis* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00) has some hard things to say of the Church over there. He seems to think that secularism has eaten into its soul. He foresees a crisis, and not so very far away, when the Lord will test His Church with severity. Will its rather flabby theology and its materialism stand the fire? The writer is the Rev. E. G. Homrighausen, Th.D., D.D., a Lecturer on Church History in Butler University. His book is an earnest summons to the Church to face Reality, to give up attempts to 'whoop up' church life by 'drives' for men and money. He is not a Fundamentalist or a Modernist, but a loyal Christian. And he sees clearly, and proclaims definitely, that what we all need is to come up against the fact of Christ, and

decide what He is to us. That is central and urgent.

Mr. Mortimer Taube is a research student in the University of California, which last year awarded him a Ph.D. degree. He has published what we take to be his thesis under the title *Causation, Freedom and Determinism* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. net). In brief, the book is a refutation of determinism, and a very cogent one. The writer shows that between causation and freedom there is no antagonism if we carefully define our terms; on the contrary, a cause must be more or less 'free.' We have an excellent account of determinism as it was held by philosophical writers of the seventeenth century; and Dr. Taube's interesting view is that they were determinists in the interest of their predestinarian theology. Science emancipated itself from theology, but quite baselessly on assumed scientific grounds continued to be deterministic. As many modern men of science maintain, there is no scientific evidence to support, still less necessitate, a deterministic view of the world. Here Dr. Taube frequently and effectively quotes Whitehead. As to the theological problem of Divine fore-ordination he has nothing to say.

In view of Dr. Taube's age—he is only twenty-five—the book is a remarkable one; and if we are not mistaken, we shall hear of him again.

We welcome the second instalment of Dr. W. K. Jordan's important work on *The Development of Religious Toleration in England* (Allen & Unwin; 21s. net). The first volume appeared in 1932 and was concerned with the Elizabethan Age; the present volume deals with the important period 1603-1640. As in the previous work we find here evidence of exhaustive consultation of contemporary documents. So thorough is this, so many all but forgotten sources of information are laid under contribution, that one is disposed to say that Dr. Jordan's work is final.

There are five long chapters with convenient sub-headings dealing with the dominant groups, first from 1603 to 1625, and then 1625 to 1640; the minority groups; the laymen and the moderates; Roman Catholic thought with reference to toleration. Every chapter is of great interest, and Dr. Jordan has put us deeply in his debt.

The Halley Stewart Trust, founded in 1924, 'for research towards the Christian ideal in all social life,' has promoted a course of lectures annually dealing in the main with topics connected with

social and moral advance. The course of lectures for 1935 was assigned to six distinguished scientists, each of whom delivered one lecture on his own subject. These lectures are now published under the title of *Scientific Progress* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). The obvious criticism suggests itself that while the individual lectures are in the highest degree excellent, and in their own sphere authoritative, the whole book lacks unity, and there seems to be no reason why these particular branches of science should be selected for treatment in preference to others. Professor Appleton deals with Electricity in the Atmosphere, Professor Mellanby gives a résumé of Progress in Medical Science, while Professor Julian Huxley treats of Science and its Relation to Social Needs. Professor J. B. S. Haldane in dealing with Human Genetics devotes considerable space to the question of sterilization and shows the very grave difficulties connected with it. Sir James Jeans and Sir William Bragg, discussing their own topics of Astronomy and Physics, raise their voices against the rigid determinism fostered by nineteenth-century science. The former says, 'We still may or may not be automata; present-day physics certainly cannot prove that we are not, but it gives no shadow of a reason for thinking that we are.' The latter concludes his lecture, 'Do not let us, therefore, be oppressed by unnecessary fears that we are but helpless cogs in a machine, but let us throw ourselves eagerly into the task of trying to interpret and live in the world in which we find ourselves.'

A small paper book that costs 10 cents is sent out by the Biblical Seminary in New York. It might well have come in a more permanent form, for it is on a great subject, and it has a good deal to say that is important. The title is *Why Read the Bible? How to Read the Bible: What to Read and Why*. The author is the Rev. Wilbert W. White, D.D., Ph.D., who has no difficulty in answering any of his own questions. The pamphlet is really worth having if only for the quotations from great men—from Huxley to Goethe—on the value of Bible reading.

Professor C. H. Dodd's Inaugural Lecture on *The Present Task in New Testament Studies*, delivered at the Divinity School, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press; 2s. net), is a very interesting survey of the special fields covered by present-day New Testament research, in respect of Textual Criticism, the Fourth Gospel and Form-

Criticism. On all these questions Professor Dodd expresses wise and discriminating judgments. He does not think that the eschatological element in the New Testament can be written off as temporary. 'The ideal interpreter would be one who has entered into that strange first-century world, has felt its whole strangeness, has sojourned in it until he has lived himself into it, thinking and feeling as one of those to whom the gospel first came; and who will then return into our world, and give to the truth he has discerned a body out of the stuff of our own thought. If there are other qualifications of which it is less fitting to speak in an academic lecture, I may be allowed to hint at them in a phrase familiar to theologians—*testimonium Spiritus Sancti internum*.' This he recognizes is an ideal which it may not be possible to realize fully, but it is here he is convinced that our task lies.

The Whispering Gallery, by the Rev. Sidney H. Price (T. & T. Clark; 2s. net), contains a series of talks to boys and girls. They are brief, original, and suggestive. They are indeed just the right length for a 'children's address,' and may therefore even in that matter present a good example to many preachers. But they will help hard-pressed ministers also by giving them at least seeds for their own sowing.

North of Nineveh, in the Taurus range of mountains, there are still Aramaic tribes belonging to the Christian faith, the descendants of the ancient Assyrians. They have preserved the customs of their ancestors, and their literature consists almost entirely of the Bible and other sacred writings. In *Gospel Light: Comments on the Teachings of Jesus from Aramaic and Unchanged Eastern Customs* (A. J. Holman Company, Philadelphia; \$2.75), by Mr. George M. Lamsa, B.A., who was born and brought up among these people, and who is known as an ethnologist and Aramaic scholar, we have four hundred pages of excellent comments on the teachings of Jesus as illustrated by Aramaic and unchanged Eastern customs. The book is interesting, not merely because it is the only commentary on the Gospels by a native Easterner who speaks both Aramaic and English, but because it portrays the Gospel scenes and events in a vivid manner and simplifies some passages hitherto obscure. Many Bible readers may find some of the utterances of Christ difficult to understand, principally because they are unfamiliar with Eastern languages and temperament. This work explains such utterances

as they have always been understood by the people of the East who still speak the Aramaic language as used by Jesus and His disciples. Mr. Lamsa believes in the healing power of Jesus, and places much importance on those works of His which tended to eliminate human suffering. His comments throw flashes of light on these by pointing to the correct interpretation of words and phrases, thus giving a proper understanding of their purpose and solving many mysteries. There is an excellent index of subjects, and a Foreword by Dr. Harrington, an ethnologist of the Smithsonian Institute, Washington. The book, being written by an Assyrian reared in Aramaic surroundings, is of a unique kind, and will be found useful to ministers, teachers, and others in their Biblical expositions and addresses.

Two Lectures delivered in Harvard University under the William Belden Noble Foundation by the Archbishop of York are published with the title *The Church and its Teaching To-day* (Macmillan; 4s. 6d. net). The first is on the 'Nature and Task of the Christian Church.' Dr. Temple emphasizes that primarily the Church is the fellowship of the redeemed united in worship of the Redeemer. If the Church forgets that, she will be no more than one society among many seeking to promote this or that good cause. The Church exists first and foremost to be the fellowship of those who worship God in Christ. But it is a God of Love whom we worship; and if we open our hearts to Him this must issue in loving activities. So the Church when it is true to itself becomes the agency through which the love of God is active in works of mercy and service in the world.

The second is on 'Christian Theology and Modern Thought.' About modern thought there are certain qualities of temper, such as insistence upon verification in experience of what is commended for acceptance, and a certain form of the doctrine of relativity especially in the study of the history of religions. Dr. Temple grants whatever of value there exists in those tendencies, and is prepared for the need of a very substantial re-thinking of a great deal that has been traditional in theology. But Faith will stand if it is of the kind that willingly submits itself to three tests: Does it appeal directly to heart and conscience? Is it producing fruit? Does it help us to understand and solve in some measure the problems of life?

With a volume on *Deuteronomy*, the Chief Rabbi

brings to a close his Commentary on the *Pentateuch and Haftorahs* (Milford; cloth, 7s. 6d.; Persian Morocco, 20s.; Venetian Rutland, 21s.), and includes lists of the Haftorahs (lessons from the historical and prophetic books to be read with the Pentateuchal sections) and an index to the whole series. All that has been said in approbation of the earlier parts of the work applies with equal, or even greater, force to this final section. The Hebrew text and the English R.V. are printed on opposite pages, with notes at the foot. The latter are based on the English text, and Hebrew words are explained where necessary, though the ordinary reader who has been trained in a Christian theological college may have some difficulty in recognizing the Hebrew words occasionally cited, since they are phonetic representations of the Ashkenazi pronunciation. The notes themselves are simple and straightforward, and deal with most of the difficulties (though not all) presented by the text. They are clearly the product of a strong desire to bring out and to make generally available the spiritual value of the text, and every class of reader will find them helpful from this point of view. The book also gains from the presence of several more extended notes on points which cannot be adequately handled in a brief footnote. Free use is made, not only of Rabbinic scholarship, but also of Christian authors, and while the standpoint is necessarily that of orthodox Judaism, the book will be found most useful by Gentiles. Dr. Hertz (and with him the whole of British Jewry) is to be congratulated warmly on the successful conclusion of this fine undertaking.

Lord Conway of Allington has had a many-sided life as an explorer, an M.P., a Slade Professor of Art at Cambridge. Moreover, he has some dozens of books to his name which have been highly praised. And now comes what one fancies he himself would put first among them—*A Pilgrim's Quest for the Divine* (Muller; 10s. 6d. net). It is the record of another and more adventurous exploration into things spiritual, and of a long search for God, begun at Cambridge, and continued through the years. It has, so we are told, been five times written and rewritten, and into it one feels the author has put all his strength and soul. No doubt it will win a response from its own circle—but for most readers it is a disappointing book. The authentic note of a real spiritual classic is absent. The seeker seems so very meagrely equipped with the requisite spiritual organs, and some of those from whom he seeks guidance, and

whose crude findings he quotes with bated breath, are so unusually shallow; and the results achieved at last so elementary and platitudinous, that it all seems much ado about very little. One is reminded of Rousseau's ugly revelations of his life coupled to his complacent assurance that no one will deny him the title of a good man by his amateur and somewhat dilettante seeker's protestations of his own hard breathing efforts; or of Wilde's 'De Profundis' with its very shallow depths of his curiously superficial quest. But apparently the author is entirely satisfied with the merest shadow of the spiritual knowledge and riches which innumerable humble souls about him have achieved by the simple device of consulting the experts in these matters.

Principal A. J. Grieve, M.A., D.D., has edited a *Supplement to Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (Nelson; 2s. net). Among his collaborators are J. W. Jack, H. Wheeler Robinson, and others well-known to our readers. The aim is to indicate the principal developments in Biblical study since the Commentary was first published in 1919, and the volume has taken the form of a series of brief surveys of the literature that has appeared between 1919 and the present time. It is a useful volume and will be particularly welcomed by possessors of Peake's Commentary. Its last page supplies a list of corrigenda.

During the nineteenth century the tone of historical research in regard to the Biblical records was to some extent one of doubt and suspicion. In the present century, however, a new note is being sounded. Thanks to the brilliant achievements of archaeology, the historical facts contained in the Old Testament are proving to be wonderfully accurate and trustworthy. It is to be regretted, however, that so many authors, in giving an account of archaeological results, fail to interpret them correctly, and draw from them suppositions and hypotheses which are scarcely warranted by the facts. The same writers usually refer to the so-called 'Higher Criticism' under the erroneous idea that it is the avowed enemy of the Bible. These are the thoughts that strike the Biblical scholar on reading *The Bible Triumphant in Twentieth-Century Discovery and Research* (Pickering & Inglis; 2s. 6d. net), by the Rev. C. Urquhart, B.A., Principal of the Perth Bible Institute, Western Australia. The book is a 'review of recent discoveries in Bible lands in their bearing upon the reliability and accuracy of the Old Testament.'

The standpoint is the Fundamentalist one, which many readers no doubt may prefer, but apart from this the volume cannot be regarded as authoritative, for competent scholars will consider many statements inaccurate, and will not be able to accept the chronology adopted. But, putting aside such drawbacks, it contains a brief survey, in popular language, of the discoveries and researches brought to light within recent years. In this connexion, it deals with Old Testament events from the Creation and the Flood down to the end of the Jewish kingdom, and may thus prove of use to Sunday-school teachers and other Bible expositors who have not access to the various original sources of information.

The Rev. J. Garrow Duncan, D.D., has long been known as an expert archaeologist, who has rendered the cause of Biblical studies valuable service by his excavations, especially in ancient Jerusalem. He has also played his part in the defence of the more conservative views of the Bible, and in *New Light on Hebrew Origins* (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net) he seeks to combine these two aspects of his work. The book is divided into three main sections: the Babylonian narratives of Genesis, the Egyptian narratives in Genesis and Exodus, and the Canaanite influence on Hebrew religion. The material is arranged in short sections, each dealing with a particular point; there are more than a hundred of them, and, especially in the first two sections, the plan and cohesion of the work are not obvious. In Part I. Dr. Duncan relies mainly on Sir Leonard Woolley, and in Part II, on Dr. Yahuda, with frequent reference to Sir Flinders Petrie; other archaeologists, Assyriologists, and Egyptologists are almost entirely neglected. In Part I. Dr. Duncan occasionally shows signs of independent judgment, as when, for instance, he recognizes that Abraham need not necessarily have lived actually in the city of Ur. In Part II. he follows Dr. Yahuda very closely, though there also we have once or twice a free expression of opinion. Part III. is by far the best. Here Dr. Duncan sometimes makes use of other scholars, but most of the matter is based on his own archaeological work, and it is this section which justifies the publication of the book, for, though he has given the substance of it elsewhere, it is here presented in a concise and readable form.

An interesting book on Christian giving has been published by the S.P.C.K.—*Almsgiving: A Handbook*, by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D.

(2s. net). Dr. Clarke first traces the customs of the Jews, the early Christians, and the successive generations of church people till the present. He then, in his second part, deals with the subject in its own nature and claims: the present situation, earning and spending, motives, competing claims, wills and endowments, a plea for simplicity, clerical problems. He adds some suggestive outlines for sermons on the subject. The book is, for its size, very thorough, and there is a mixture of shrewd sense and spirituality which is attractive. Clergymen will be interested to learn that 'Priests are not at liberty to marry merely for "love," irrespective of whether the woman will make a good clergyman's wife.' Even here there is a characteristically sensible point.

There is to be a Conference of the Churches at Oxford in 1937, and an International Christian Youth Conference will meet in 1939. In preparation for these Conferences, Mr. H. W. Fox, Hon. Secretary of the British Council of the World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches, has prepared two books. One, already published, was called 'Loyalties to Church and State.' The second one has just appeared, *The Kingship of Christ*, in Education, History, Economics and International Relations. The object of the Conferences is to state the Christian values in view of attacks made upon them to-day by Communism, Paganism, and Materialism. And it is of grave importance that Christian people should rightly understand the issues, and the claims of such issues. Mr. Fox has written this book to promote discussion, and each of its four chapters, on the subjects above mentioned, has questions added to provoke thought. The whole matter is dealt with briefly but in an earnest, challenging, and intelligent fashion in these chapters (S.C.M.; 1s. net).

School 'Prayers,' in other words, the opening service with which most schools begin the day,

presents a real problem to the teacher. However willing the spirit is, the flesh is sometimes weak. The teacher is shy of conducting such a service on his own. Well, for one part at least of this task the Student Christian Movement Press has just given some assistance in a new book—*Readings from the Bible for School Prayers*, compiled by Miss M. E. Jarvis, M.A., Headmistress of the Girls' County School, Brecon (3s. 6d. net). The compiler has chosen for each week a subject, and five brief readings reveal its main aspects. The readings are simple and practical. A few illuminating notes are added which may enable the teacher to give in a sentence something that will make the passage intelligible and interesting. Little that has importance for the life of youth has been overlooked. The great truths and the great virtues (and the small) are all here. This is a book that many teachers will hail with gratitude.

Still another series of popular apologetic books at a cheap rate, but written by eminent theologians, is being issued. Canon Barry, the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, the Rev. F. A. Cockin, and Dom Bernard Clements are among the writers, and the subjects are 'Our Faith in God,' 'The Person of Christ,' 'The Holy Spirit and the Church,' 'Worship,' and, finally, 'Ethics.' The first volume, *Our Faith in God*, is by the Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. W. R. Matthews (S.C.M.; 3s. 6d. net). It bears on every page the characteristic stamp of the Dean's mind. It is interesting. It is massive. It is simple. And it is persuasive. The special topics in this first volume are: Religion and Belief in God; The Hebrew Conception of God; The Revelation of God in Christ; Personality in God; The Trinity and Human Thought; The Love of God; The Love of God and Evil. It would be superfluous to praise the book. It may, however, be hoped that the book will circulate largely, because it possesses a quality invaluable in such literature—a direct sincerity which is disarming to all cavillers.

The Best Books on the Life of Christ.

BY PROFESSOR J. A. ROBERTSON, D.D., ABERDEEN.

EXCEPT for the Apocryphal lives, almost all the biographies of Christ are modern. The Gospels are not lives of our Lord, but rather records of impressions which the man Jesus made upon His con-

temporaries. They are testimonies rather than histories, 'pure crude fact secreted from men's lives when hearts beat hard.' They are characterized by an extraordinary parsimony. A life is

an objective record of facts extending from the cradle to the grave. The Gospels are but the records of a few brief weeks in two or three years of Christ's life, proclaiming the reaction of men's souls to His impact upon them. And they show a marked restraint which is very striking when we compare it to the extravagances of the Apocryphal tales. The study of these tales must, indeed, be followed in a mind familiar with the Synoptic Gospels, by a deep uprush of wonder and faith. For what else could have ensured the survival, the age-long veneration, the unbroken, mysterious power and attraction of the Synoptic story through centuries of folly, noise, and sin, and relegated those strange vivid Apocryphal stories to their present dusty obscurity, but the very mind of Christ, dwelling in His disciples? A gospel can only survive if it is written upon the hearts of men, but it must be written in the indelible ink of Truth. And these other writings, so full of colour and charm, and with all sorts of interesting incidents to relate, have not stood this test. It is not merely that they withered away because of their admission of miraculous events. The Church was uncritical on this point until quite recently. The weakness goes deeper; there is a lack of moral content, of spiritual reality, in them all.

As early as the fourth century we begin to have dramatic renderings of the gospel story. The earliest known Christian Passion play borrows much of its verse from Euripides, and most of the action is laid behind the scenes, and is only reported by messengers. Then more and more, as the music of the Gregorian Mass wearied men with its monotony, processions and oratorios took its place, Christ was tenor and Pilate was bass, Adam and Eve carried the Tree of Knowledge, the Baptist his banner and lamp, Judas his bag, and the Holy women their precious ointment, until, from these simple beginnings, we have, in the mediæval Church such a wide-spread use of religious drama, that the gospel story, read in the churches only in Latin, was played in the vernacular, and often half the town would be in the play, and the other half spectators. It has often been lamented that this method of teaching the Gospels was discarded by Protestantism at the Reformation, but people forget that already by then a deterioration in these sacred dramas had become evident, and their religious value was becoming very doubtful.

Save for the first volume of the *Golden Legend*, there were practically no extra-canonical lives of our Lord printed during the Middle Ages, or indeed until quite modern times. The *Golden Legend* was

compiled by the Bishop of Genoa about 1275, and the first of the six volumes is devoted to the life of Christ. But it is so steeped in the supernatural, and so much more fantastic than historical, that it must be grouped with the old miracle plays rather than with the later Lives.

Then came the Reformation and the translation of the Gospels into the vernacular. It is difficult for us now to grasp how soul-stirring and inspiring that unveiling must have been. Almost it must have been as if men listened with their own ears to the words of the Master, 'The children of the bride-chamber fast not when the Bridegroom is with them.' That freshness endured for centuries. The pious Christian could wish for nothing more than the sacred page itself.

But with the nineteenth century came the days of scientific research, and nothing was exempt. The first great modern life of Jesus was that written by Strauss. In it, reflecting the spirit of his time, he resolves testimony into myth, and discounts the miraculous element. It was published in the year 1846, and was called *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. It was founded upon a false critical hypothesis, but nevertheless it fell like a bombshell from the sky into the heart of Victorian orthodoxy. All through the 'fifties it troubled the faith of our land. The struggle came to a head in the early 'sixties, and is reflected in Browning's *Death in the Desert*, where the poet replies to the destructive arguments of the critic. What was it that Strauss had said? He had declared that we know next to nothing about the actual historic Figure of Jesus of Nazareth. In all the four Gospels Strauss finds His Person shrouded and clouded in the luminous mist of legend and myth which always gathers about the memory of a great man after he has passed away. And in particular in the Gospel according to John, Strauss argues that the Jesus of history almost entirely disappears and in His stead there is painted the portrait, not of a man, but of a ghostly being from the unseen world, framed in a purely imaginary or fictitious setting. All the stories, Strauss asseverates, are symbolical, and the whole document is a subtle and deceptive attempt to persuade men that the carpenter of Nazareth was divine.

After Strauss came Renan, with his *Vie de Jésus*. It was thought out, and partly executed, in Palestine, and the writer's imagination, untroubled and serene, reflects the sacred landscape with the clear faithfulness of some quiet pool beneath the hills. Here, again, miracle is discounted, but Jesus is described as the warm, kindly, genial, and joy-loving Jew, who flings his life away, half-spent, for an

unattainable ideal. The life is an idyll, exquisite, but without any surplus of moral inspiration in its pages. This book, too, made a great sensation when it appeared. It passed through eight editions in three months. It evoked wild streams of criticism, as well as of praise. One of the most striking achievements of the writer is that he has at one and the same time stripped the sacred portrait of every shred of supernaturalism, and left it enthroned as an object of adoration and worship.

Still taking rank as one of the best of the Lives of Jesus is that of Keim, although it appeared as long ago as 1876-83. Keim had no particular theological or critical axe to grind, but was consistently absorbed in trying to discover what really happened, and what was really said, and in consequence he finds a place in the van of modern critical New Testament scholarship. The effect upon the reader is that of a life written from an advanced liberal point of view. Only he considers Matthew to be the primary Gospel. But he does not attempt to harmonize the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics. He divides the Life of our Lord into two periods, the early period when He was a successful teacher, and the later one when He was a broken, hunted man, fleeing to escape His enemies. In Jesus he finds the loftiest ideal of humanity, the supreme illustration of what human life can attain.

There are other lives by Beyschlag, Haase, Schenkel, H. J. Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, B. Weiss, and there is Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus*. Each has its own particular merits, and sets forth many an aspect of the life in a clearer light. Yet in sum they add little to what can be found in Keim.

A book which made a great sensation when it appeared was *Ecce Homo*, by Seeley, in which the human Christ is set forth in all His graciousness and charm. As he says himself in his Preface, his book is 'not a book of authority, but of inquiry and suggestion; it is intended not to close discussion, but to open it. It asks for consideration and, where it is wrong, for refutation.' He accepts the evidence of all the Evangelists, where they agree. He regards the miracles as at least no after-thoughts of the biographers. The Fourth Gospel is not referred to except in confirmation of statements made in the other Gospels. He says he is glad to have been able 'to draw the attention of the public to that part of Christianity, and for a time to that part alone, in which almost all men are able on the whole to agree, and much of which the greater number of Christian teachers, by taking for granted, practically suppress.' These words indicate that although the book was published so long ago as

1865, its value to-day remains very high. It is only too possible for us to be absorbed in some burning theological problem of the hour, as, for example, the Barthian conception of God, to the exclusion of much other vital matter. Religious experience may be dangerously impoverished in such a case.

Doubly interesting because of the personality of its writer, is *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, by Albert Schweitzer. Here he relentlessly traverses the history of criticism, making the figure of Jesus entirely apocalyptic. He says: 'He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lake-side, He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word: "Follow thou me," and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfil for our time.' He says: 'Jesus as a concrete historical personality remains a stranger to our time, but His spirit, which lies hidden in His words, is known in simplicity, and its influence is direct.' This influence has been sufficient to send Schweitzer out to the mission field, and to make him one of the greatest missionaries of our day. It may be, one cannot help surmising, an influence more direct, less entangled with the toils of conscious thought, than even Schweitzer suspects. Otherwise the following passage is difficult to harmonize with his career. 'Jesus, in the knowledge that He is the coming Son of Man lays hold of the wheel of the world to set it moving on that last revolution which is to bring all ordinary history to a close. It refuses to turn, and He throws Himself upon it. Then it does turn; and crushes Him. Instead of bringing in the eschatological conditions, He has destroyed them. The wheel rolls onward, and the mangled body of the one immeasurably great Man, who was strong enough to think of Himself as the spiritual ruler of mankind and to bend history to His purpose, is hanging upon it still. That is His victory and His reign.' Was that the theory which sent Schweitzer forth into Darkest Africa? Or was he rather compelled by the Influence of which in the previous quotation he speaks, direct and simple, working, not upon an ingenious and sophisticated intellect, but upon an eager and child-like soul?

Another modern Life, which acquired additional interest because of its writer, was that of the Italian journalist, Giovanni Papini, who wrote the book in the white heat of his conversion from scepticism. It is an imaginative reconstruction of the life of Jesus, within the bounds of orthodoxy.

J. Warschauer's *Historical Life of Christ* is a modernist reconstruction of the gospel story. Here the supernatural is reduced to a minimum,

or rather to vanishing point. He takes it, as Professor Burkitt writes in the Preface, 'as an axiom that modern investigation and discovery has revolutionised our ideas about external nature and the course of ancient history. . . . How did this apparently insignificant episode become the starting-point of so great and persistent development? It is not enough for the Modernist to reject the Catholic view: if his view is to supplant the Catholic view, it must be because it is more adequate, because it is more nearly in harmony with all the facts, the facts not only of the "Life of Christ," but also of the enthusiasm and persistence of the Christians. And here, as it seems to me, comes in the value of Dr. Warschauer's actual achievement.'

Among the ever-increasing number of studies of the Life by laymen, that of J. Middleton Murry has taken a prominent place. This writer does not hesitate to ascribe sinfulness to Jesus, alleging that his submission to baptism could not have been undertaken without consciousness of guilt. The book may be somewhat inchoate and frothy, but it has the great merit of provoking and disturbing the minds and souls of a group of readers who find a more formal theology distasteful. Then there is the *Jesus of Nazareth* by Klausner, the Jewish author. The book is, on the whole, sympathetically written, but it is critical of certain of Jesus' points of view, particularly of His attitude to the scribes and Pharisees of His day, an attitude which Klausner considers was too radical in its condemnation.

We have said nothing of the large number of contemporary plays and novels, more or less based upon the gospel story. Some of these have merit,

notably, among the historical works, George Moore's *The Brook Kerith*, though here neither the psychology nor the history is good, only the beauty of the style is outstanding. Good also is Sudermann's *John*, Rostand's *The Samaritan Woman*, Andreyev's *Judas Iscariot and the Others*. Among the works which attempt to reincarnate something of Jesus' bearing and power there stand out Fogazzaro's *Saint*, Dostoevsky's *Idiot*, Kennedy's *Servant in the House*, Jerome K. Jerome's *Passing of the Third Floor Back*, Gerhart Hauptmann's *Fool in Christ*. But very often the portrait of Jesus which has been painted in plays and novels is nothing more than a picture of the writer's personal ideal man, set against the Galilean background, or, if the hero is modern, endowed with some of the more conventional trappings of Divinity.

Contrasting with these, and of far more value, is a group where there is an imaginative attempt to live out, or think out, the life of Jesus amid the social conditions of our time. Among these there stand out Tolstoi's *Confessions*, Florence Converse's *Children of Light*, Rosegger's *God-Seekers* and his *I.N.R.I.*, Paul Heyse's *Children of the World*, Frenssen's *Hilligenlei*, and Selma Lagerlöf's *Miracles of Anti-Christ*. This last is a fine study of the relationship of Socialism and Christianity, or rather, we might say, a moving revelation of the narrowness of the awful gulf which separates every dream of an earthly Paradise from the Christian vision of the Kingdom of God. Socialism, the author maintains, is Anti-Christ, and the task of the Church is not to demolish this great ideal, but to remould it into the heavenly pattern.

The Origin and Growth of Religion.

BY THE REVEREND CANON J. BATTERSBY HARFORD, D.D., RIPON.

THE history of religion provides us with a study, which is fascinating, but also of great difficulty. Thinking men must always have had times when their thoughts turned back to the past and they asked themselves: What was the form which religion took at the beginning of our human race? But it was only towards the end of the eighteenth century that the comparative study of religion took scientific shape. Following upon the discoveries of new continents in the sixteenth and

seventeenth centuries, and of peoples and religions hitherto unknown, men, seeing the immense number of forms in which religion had taken shape upon this earth, were compelled to ask: How came religion to take so many forms? What can it have been like at the beginning?

It was natural that at first Christian scholars should turn to the Old Testament, and that some should have thought that whatsoever was good in pagan religions must have been borrowed

from the Jews. But as time went on, the study of Hebrew religion broadened out. The more the religions of the Semitic world round about Israel were studied, the more clear it became that certain elements in Hebrew religion were common to all early Semites, nor could stop be made there. Further study showed that certain elements were common to early mankind as a whole.

This study of religion was not, however, confined to men whose chief interest was religious. It was taken up by other men, who approached it from a more purely scientific point of view.

In this article it will only be possible to give a very brief sketch of the successive theories claiming to give an account of the origin and growth of religion which arose one after the other during the nineteenth century. The main body of the article will be given to an exposition of the latest theory, which has come to the front in this twentieth century, and to show how it has been arrived at.

1. In the attempt to evolve a reasonable theory of the origin of religion, the first steps were taken by a school of thinkers who regarded religion as arising from the observation of Nature. Natural objects, especially the principal heavenly bodies, were, they said, personified and myths evolved. Max Müller, for many years Professor of Sanscrit, at Oxford, was, in England at any rate, the most popular apostle of this school.¹ This theory of Nature myths was largely founded on the discovery and investigation of the Indo-Germanic religions which had been brought to light in the latter half of the eighteenth century. We now know that this whole culture was neither simple nor primary, but Nature myths did play an important, often a dominant, part in the religion of these peoples. A supreme Sky-God was recognized in them all and was called Father; *Ζεὺς πατήρ*; Juppiter, in Sanscrit Dyauspitar. In the Vedic Age Varuna supplants Dyauspitar. 'In his whole nature,' writes von Schroeder, 'in the exalted dignity and majesty of his appearance, in his attributes as Creator, Orderer, Upholder, and Governor of the world, in his spotless purity and cleanness, in the holy anger with which he judges and punishes the wicked, in his grace and mercy towards the penitent' he appears as a real Supreme Being.

2. The far-reaching importance of Nature myths of Indo-European peoples is undoubted, but in Max Müller's own lifetime it was overshadowed

¹ His Hibbert Lectures on *The Origin and Growth of Religion* were published in 1878.

by new discoveries of the history and pre-history of mankind. *The Origin of Species by Natural Selection*, by Charles Darwin, was published in 1859, and, as time went on, the theory of development was applied to the history of religion, and evolutionism was born. Auguste Comte expounded the theory that Fetishism (*i.e.* as he used the word, the worship of all objects in Nature as such) was the original form of religion, and Sir John Lubbock twenty years later invented a whole series of stages from Atheism, through Fetishism, to God as Creator and ethical religion. But their views were soon shown to be incorrect by Rosskoff and others.

3. It was Herbert Spencer who, in 1872 and following years, produced the next leading theory of religion, namely, Ghost-worship. He based his view upon the phenomena of Ancestor worship. Some remarkable man, regarded with awe during his life, was regarded, he said, with increasing awe after his death, and the propitiation of his ghost developed into an established worship. This was worked out at great length, but without the least attempt to ascertain by genuine historical methods the chronology of the various kinds of Ancestor worship. These were arranged in an order determined solely by their apparent evolution from a psychological point of view. Later research shows that Ancestor worship is not the origin of religion. It is found to be very feebly developed in the oldest cultures, while a monotheistic belief is already clearly found there.

4. A new school arose, side by side with that of Spencer, as the result of the work of E. B. Tylor, whose book *Primitive Culture* was published in 1872. His theory was called Animism. Primitive man, he said, meditating on his experiences of sleep, ecstasy, illness, and death on the one hand, and those of dreams and visions on the other, arrived at the concept of a soul. Tylor traced this conception of a soul through dead ancestors, Nature and polytheism up to monotheism. Thus we come last to the Supreme Being. Like Spencer, Tylor worked in the heyday of evolutionism, and assumed an upward development of mankind along a single line. But, as with Spencer so with Tylor, no proof is forthcoming in his works that the single stages of this process had any historical connexion with one another. Animism for a long time enjoyed undisputed predominance, but—

5. It was eventually challenged from two sides—on the one hand by students of Nature mythology in general, and on the other by students of the newly discovered world of Assyria, Babylonia, and neighbouring lands. The two movements soon

coalesced. The star myth line was led by Siecke and others. Siecke showed that the Nature myths were always based on something seen in the sky. They are childlike deductions from the marvels of the world around, and especially the movements of the heavenly bodies. They had nothing to do with belief in a soul, nor with dreams and nightmares. A special branch of the star myth school is that which is known as Pan-Babylonianism, and is represented by Winckler and Jeremias (1900-1913). All myths, they said, were concerned with the phenomena of the heavens. The heavenly bodies and their movements were to the Babylonians the principal revelation of the power and will of the Deity. The priests read these and set forth their doctrines in dramatic performances. The whole arrangement of Holy Days on earth was decided by the revolutions of the heavenly bodies. The myths of every people on earth were said by Winckler and Jeremias to be influenced by the system which was fully developed in Babylon by 3000 B.C. and which spread with the spread of mankind. But, in fact, there is no such agreement between the star myths of savage peoples and those of Babylonia as would justify us in declaring that there has been any historical connexion. Those of primitive peoples are not above the level of the rest of their culture, and the idea that astronomy and astrology were so developed in Babylonia by 3000 B.C. is declared to be quite untenable by Kugler, a scholar equally eminent in Astronomy and in Assyriology.

6. A new factor in the science of religion, namely, Totemism, was introduced by J. F. M'Lennan in 1869, and was taken up for a time by Sir J. G. Frazer in 1887-1910. Totemism is the name given to a belief of certain peoples that their families and clans stood in a definite blood-relationship to particular species of animals. W. Robertson Smith, a former pupil of M'Lennan's, made Totemism the starting-point of religion, and especially of Hebrew religion. The sacrificial victim was the totem-animal. Later researches on historical lines seem to have made this quite untenable.

7. As early as 1892 J. H. King put forward the theory that magic came before Animism, but it was not until 1900 that R. R. Marett introduced the theory of magic as the origin of religion, while Sir J. G. Frazer became its great exponent in his *Golden Bough*, with its sub-title 'A Study in Magic and Religion.' Similar views were set forth by a number of writers in Germany, America, and England. All these writers almost entirely lacked any objective evidence as to the order of develop-

ment of the various phases of magical ideas. With some peoples the belief in magic is much stronger than with others. Here the most modern method of study comes in and shows that only to a comparatively small extent do the most primitive races of to-day have magical beliefs and practices, while at the same time they most definitely worship a personal and moral Supreme Being. Religion accordingly is not later than magic, but in all probability has preceded it.

8. We thus come finally to the Pastoral Nomadic culture, and there we find the belief in the supreme Sky-God, which persists in its full force amongst these great cattle-breeding peoples. This culture is found in its natural state in the Ural-Altaic and Hamitic peoples, but all the Indo-European and nearly all the Semitic peoples belonged originally to this culture. This belief in a Supreme Sky-God has only lately been made the starting-point of a theory of the origin of religion. In 1920, however, an article by G. Foucart on 'Sky and Sky-Gods' appeared in Hastings' *ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. And Professor A. B. Cook, author of the monumental work, *Zeus*, shows that classical antiquity points to belief in this Supreme Being of the sky as the starting-point of religion in the Greek world. 'It would seem,' he says, 'that at first Zeus was conceived, not anthropomorphically as the bright Sky-God, but as the bright sky itself, credited with an impersonal life of its own. . . . When those who first used the word *Zeus* went out into the world and looked abroad, they found themselves over-arched by the blue and brilliant sky, a luminous Something fraught with incalculable possibilities of weal or woe. It cheered them with its steady sunshine. It scared them with its flickering fires. It fanned their cheeks with cool breezes or set all knees a-tremble with reverberating thunder. It mystified them with its birds winging their way in ominous silence or talking secrets in an unknown tongue. It paraded before men's eyes a splendid succession of celestial phenomena, and underwent for all to see the daily miracle of darkness and dawn. Inevitably, perhaps instinctively, they would regard it with awe—that primitive blend of religious feelings—and would go on to conciliate it by any means in their power. . . .' J. G. Frazer argued that man in due course sought to control its actions by the naïve arts of magic, but that eventually the supreme medicine-man became the sacred King, his magical functions gradually giving place to priestly or even divine duties, as magic was slowly ousted by religion. Frazer urged that

shrewder intelligences, realizing the frequent failure of human magic, ascribed this to the more powerful magic of great invisible beings—i.e. the gods—and thus escaped from the troubled sea of doubt and uncertainty into 'the quiet haven of religion,' thus putting magic first and religion second in order of time. But as Professor A. B. Cook pertinently asks, 'Why should these shrewder intelligences—indeed, how could they—assume a Sky-God, unless the sky was already regarded as a Divine Potency?' And, if this was the case, then religion was not subsequent to magic but either prior to it, or at least coeval with it.

'Personally,' Professor Cook went on, 'I should not refuse the term religious to the attitude of religious awe with which I suppose early man to have approached the animate sky. Indeed, it would not be absurd to maintain that the pre-anthropomorphic conception was in some respects higher, because truer, than later anthropomorphism. After all, "God is not a man," and early thought could hardly be drawn nearer to the idea of the Infinite than by contemplating the endless blue of heaven.'

'Nevertheless the shift from Sky to Sky-God was a momentous one, a fact which modified the whole course of Greek religion, and its ultimate consequence was nothing less than the rise of faith in a Personal God, the Ruler and Father of all.'

So far the student of Greek religion. Alongside this we must now place the evidence which is forthcoming, when we consider the religious beliefs of the lowliest living races. In 1884 to 1886 A. W. Howitt published the results of personal investigations obtained by actual residence among tribes in south-east Australia. He testified to the existence among these tribes of a belief in a High God, known by different tribes under different names, but essentially the same in all, and of the evidence for this belief afforded by the initiation ceremonies at puberty of the young members of these tribes—ceremonies to which he himself had been admitted. E. B. Tylor at once fully admitted as proved the existence among these tribes of a belief in High Gods, but in 1891, in an article on 'Limits of Savage Religion,' he sought to prove that this belief was not native, but was due to missionary influence from Europe. He was obliged to do this, for one of the axioms of his animistic theory was that monotheism was comparatively modern and had everywhere developed out of a lower animistic form of belief. Howitt, however, directly countered Tylor's suggestion by definite and circumstantial proofs that the belief in High

Gods was really native and was not due to any outside influence, and N. W. Thomas and Andrew Lang decisively supported Howitt by further proofs. Andrew Lang was at first a follower of Tylor, but after Howitt's accounts of savage beliefs in Australia he took his stand against the *a priori* view that monotheism must everywhere have developed out of an earlier animistic form of belief. In 1898 he published *The Making of Religion*, and he followed this up by extensive revisions of his earlier works. Lang's argument was acutely reasoned, but at his date the relevant material was only partially available. The more complete form of the argument has been developed by Professor W. Schmidt of Vienna in a book which was published in 1930, and which has been translated by Professor H. J. Rose of St. Andrews (1931). This book provides the basis of this article. On page 258 of the English translation, Professor Schmidt's Table of the Groupings of existing Cultures is to be found. It may be summarized as follows:

I. PRIMITIVE CULTURES (Food Gatherers).—In these races man does not yet assist Nature to increase her productivity; he contents himself by gathering from her what she has to offer of her own accord. At this stage the men get food by hunting, and the women by collecting plants. We can differentiate three (or four) cultures at this stage.

II. PRIMARY CULTURES (Food Producers).—There are three divisions. (1) Pastoral Nomads (cattle breeders). (2) Higher Hunters (town culture, founders of art, craftsmanship, and trade). (3) Horticultural (founders of village culture). These divisions took place independently, although later each one tended to take up elements of one or both the others.

III. SECONDARY CULTURES (results of crossings of the Primary Cultures with one another, or with Primitive Cultures).—Two divisions exist which are found here and there as late as historical times in West Asia and in Europe.

IV. TERTIARY CULTURES (oldest civilizations of Asia, Europe, and America).—Ethnology thus provides us with a chronological chart of Cultures. For our purpose we must now concentrate on the group of Cultures, which form the primitive group. They are clearly older than the Primary group. The proof of their higher antiquity rests mainly on three positive considerations and one negative.

(a) Their geographical positions.—Their habitats are extremely remote, in such isolated regions as betray their character as the last refuges of fugitives.

They are hardest of access and the least attractive. In such regions these races are the only inhabitants, and no traces of an earlier population are to be found. Such are the Pygmies and Pygmoids of Asia and Africa, the oldest tribes of the extreme south-east of Australia, the Samoyeds, Ainu, and the Cariboo Esquimaux, and in North America the Algonkin tribes.

(b) Their economic conditions.—These peoples (with a few small exceptions) are all in the initial stage. They are food gatherers.

(c) The primitive state of their houses, clothing, tools, and weapons, and the simplicity of their social arrangements, in which the individual family plays the fundamental part.

(d) Negatively, these people do not exhibit the characteristics of the Primary Cultures (or at best exhibit them only in a sporadic, superficial, and late form). They have neither the higher hunting nor Totemism, neither agriculture nor mother right, neither cattle breeding nor the undivided family; they lack the more developed forms of houses, pottery, weaving, and of course metallurgy.

Now the religious concepts of these races are our principal base for attacking the problem of the origin of religion, for, comparatively, they are the nearest to that origin. We must, however, realize that these peoples have stood still in religion as in all else and therefore exhibit an inevitable fossilization and a loss of inner vitality, which is especially fatal to anything so essentially spiritual as religion. And secondly, even in this earliest stage of culture we find at least three, perhaps four, completely different types of culture with different religions. This shows that there must have been a long interval between the first original state and the date of these differentiated cultures. We cannot immediately from them derive the original form of religion, but we can by working out the common elements in these primitive religions come a long way nearer the original form. Moreover, some later forms may have preserved original elements which have been lost by the primitive peoples, who are only insignificant fragments of races and who probably never were important. Our picture of the primitive religion must therefore be somewhat fluid. Not only may later cultures have retained certain elements of the original religion which must be added, but the most primitive tribes may have received contaminations from later sources which must be subtracted. Some such can already be seen. Meantime already the knowledge of the primitive peoples has grown so much more exact during the

last few decades that it has done away with a whole series of earlier hypotheses concerning the origin of religion.

The first point brought out by the study of the most primitive cultures is the clear, vivid, and direct belief in a Supreme Being which is found in them. This belief is to be found in a dominant position among all the primitive peoples. It must have been deeply rooted in this most ancient of human cultures at the very dawn of time before the individual groups separated one from the other. A number of writers have, however, questioned whether this belief was genuinely monotheistic. The reply is that a sufficient number of tribes do hold a really monotheistic belief in a Supreme Being. It is true that the fact of their monotheistic belief has in many cases been obscured by later importations, but exact analysis enables us to separate these later accretions. The most primitive races never think of the Supreme Being as having wife or children. We do find in some cases other superior beings—a First Father, an Originator of Evil, a Divine Protector of beasts—but they do not deserve the title of gods. They have been created by the Supreme Being and have obtained their powers from him, and in many cases he still superintends their occupations and functions.

The Habitation of the Supreme.—He is not so closely associated with the sky as he is in the later cultures, especially among the Pastoral Nomads. Most primitive races say that he originally lived on earth with men and that he taught them all manner of good and instructed them in social and moral laws. The North American primitives, however, say that he originally came down to earth from the sky, while practically among all the primitives it is agreed that he left the earth, generally because of some evil behaviour of mankind and that he now lives in the sky.

The Form of the Supreme Being.—There seem to be two groups. According to the one he cannot be perceived by the senses; according to the other he has human form but of an exceptional kind—as ‘shining white,’ or ‘like fire,’ and so on. No image of him is anywhere made save where he has come to be regarded as one with the First Father.

The Name of the Supreme Being.—Father is that most widely distributed and is clearly primæval. Less often he is called Creator, but this is widely used by North American Indians. Sometimes he is called ‘he that is above’ or ‘is in the sky,’ and occasionally as ‘the old one,’ ‘the primæval, the Divine Sky-Lord,’ etc.

The Qualities of the Supreme Being.—(i) ‘Eternal.’

He 'existed before all things,' 'never dies,' has always been and always will be. Only where there has been a crossing with the First Father is his death ever spoken of, and that only in two or three cases. (ii) Omniscient. He supervises the conduct of mankind. In some cases the stars are God's eyes. (iii) Beneficent, altogether good. All good and only good comes from Him. (iv) Without exception he is unalterably righteous. He is the giver of the moral law (the only exceptions being the Bushmen, Koryaks, and Esquimaux). His commands are especially impressed upon the young men at their initiation. The obedience of the primitives to the Supreme Being is in strong contrast to their freedom from authority in social and political matters. (v) All-powerful. He creates 'out of nothing' according to many North American primitives, he rewards obedience and punishes the morally bad, either personally or through subordinate beings. These punishments are inflicted on earth and, according to the great majority, also in the world beyond. All believe in a future life, and almost all in a distinction between good and bad, and especially of reward to the good, who usually go to the sky. Even after his departure from earth, the Supreme Being is regarded as influencing men by reason of his omnipotence and goodness, his oversight and his future judgment. He is not idle and remote from men. Primitive man shows in many ways his sense of dependence upon the Supreme; he seeks to set up a personal relationship with his god by prayer, sacrifice, and ceremony. (a) By Prayer. Unspoken prayers and gestures and spontaneous informal prayers are often undiscovered, when investigators do not know the native language or do not live patiently among them. Some people pray, but only at rare intervals. (b) By Sacrifices. These are found among a number of tribes, but seem to be entirely lacking among South and East Australians and one or two other tribes. Pygmies, Bushmen, and Arctic primitives offer first-fruits and food in recognition of the sovereignty over the necessities of life. This custom was not derived from the feeding of the dead. This is practically unknown in any tribes of primitives. (c) By Ceremonies. These, especially where there is no sacrifice and little prayer, are regarded as founded by the Supreme himself, and many last weeks and even months. The initiation ceremonies of the youths make them capable of founding families, and are the occasions for imparting to them the tribe's wisdom and virtue. In central California, etc., the ceremonies take the form of

sacramental commemorations. They enact the creation of the world and of men, and aim to bring the help of God upon the family, tribe, and world. Where the best and most thoroughly trained observers have been at work these festivals are found, and similar discoveries may yet be made in other areas.

The results of our study of the most primitive peoples, brief as it has been, seem to justify us in the conviction that religion began with the belief in a High God. This belief met their human needs. It gave them a rational explanation of the world in which they lived. It met their social needs by belief in a Supreme Being who was the Father of mankind, who founded the family, and to whom all owed allegiance and obedience. One who was lawgiver, judge, and overseer, who was himself wholly good and who was supreme and omnipresent, met their moral needs and assured them of protection. Only through their conception of this Supreme Being was primitive man enabled to struggle onward and upward.

But, if so, 'how,' as Menzies asked in his *History of Religion*, 'could all mankind forget a pure religion?' How could this Supreme Being be superseded in practical regard in the later cultures by a host of inferior and often immoral gods? Andrew Lang's answer was: It is accounted for by the attraction which animism and ancestor worship, when once developed, possessed for the natural man. The equal Father of all men cannot be 'squared' and declines to make himself useful to one man rather than another. The ancestral spirit, on the other hand, can be 'squared' by people in whom he takes a special interest for family reasons. A moral Creator in need of no gifts will not help a man who wants love spells or the destruction of his enemy by witchcraft. Ghost-gods, on the other hand, in need of food and blood, afraid of spells and binding charms, are to such a useful constituency. The natural man, being what he is, was certain to go a-whoring after such apparently useful ghost-gods, to neglect the idea of a moral Creator, and eventually to reckon Him either as indulging in epicurean repose in disregard of human affairs, or as only one, if the highest, of the rabble of hungry gods, and who therefore must be sacrificed to as well as they. Where the latter opinion prevailed, the well-being of the State and, still more, the interests of the priests or magicians were involved in the maintenance of the animistic system, and only the moral monotheism of Hebrew prophets, and later of Christianity or Islam, could sweep it away.

Huxley and Herbert Spencer had no doubt that Israel itself began with ghost-worship and passed through Ancestor-worship, Fetishism, and Totemism to reach the level of the God of the older portions of Judges and Samuel, and eventually to the higher level of the Jehovah of the Prophets. But was this the true course of events? If man began with belief in a throng of serviceable ghost-gods, would he be likely enthusiastically to welcome belief in a moral Creator, who could not be bribed and who only cared for obedience? May we not

rather opine that the moral element in Jehovah worship was the survival of the primitive, divinely taught ethics which we have seen to be known to primitive man. This primitive belief may well have been kept alive by men of religious genius, such as Moses and the Prophets and Psalmists of Israel, and brought to perfection (as we who are Christians believe) by our Lord Jesus Christ. This belief in a Supreme Being assures us that from the first God revealed Himself to man and taught him at last to worship in spirit and in truth.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

The Power of a Name.

BY THE REVEREND DR. C. W. BUDDEN, M.A., CROYDON.

'There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.'—Ac 4¹².

You have heard a wonderful story: how a poor cripple who had lain on his mat at the gate of the Temple of Jerusalem for years, begging from the people as they passed in and out, had been suddenly healed by Peter and John so that he could walk and run with the best of them. But how had Peter and John done this wonderful thing? That was the puzzle. Reports said that their own explanation of the matter was simply this: 'And his name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong.' Yes; but what was the name that had such power? That was what the rulers and the great ones wanted to know, and so they summoned Peter and John before them, and asked, 'By what power, or by what name, have ye done this?'—and the Apostles had made answer that it was the name of Jesus Christ that had effected the miracle, and then they added: 'There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved'—and that is my text.

Now every one wants to be safe. It is one of the great blessings of our own land that we live in safety, so different from a country like Spain, where no one seems safe. And we know that many people seek our country as a place of refuge—a sanctuary. Even a murderer is protected by the Law until he has been tried and found guilty, and when a man commits a crime he does not hide from the

vengeance of those he has wronged. The man he is terrified of is a policeman. But this was not always so. In olden days, before Law and order were established, personal vengeance followed the criminal. But personal vengeance is a bad thing. 'Vengeance is mine,' saith the Lord, 'I will repay it.'

In the Middle Ages churches were used as places of refuge into which fugitives could enter and enjoy at least temporary safety. At the north door of Durham Cathedral there is a large knocker which was sounded by a person claiming sanctuary. In the sacred building two men were on duty day and night ever ready to open the door quickly and let the fugitive in. And in the East, where blood feuds were carried on from father to son, these places were numerous. We recall the old cities of Refuge that were established in Palestine. But there were other methods of taking sanctuary, some of which survive to-day. A man, pursued by the avenger of blood, may seize hold of the dress of a woman and find temporary safety—that law holds good to-day among the cattlemen on the western ranches of America. Or a man might take refuge in the house or tent of a person. No matter what trouble or inconvenience might be caused by the presence of the uninvited guest, it is thought very disgraceful to refuse such an asylum if it be sought. Many lives are saved every year in Bible lands to-day by these means.

But perhaps the house or tent is not accessible. Then the fugitive may call upon the name of some person of power and rank, and this appeal to the name is considered equivalent to entering his house. If the chieftain whose name is thus called upon be

a strong man—greatly to be feared—the pursuer would hesitate, if there were witnesses, to risk his vengeance. So we read in the Psalms: ‘Save me, O God, by thy name, and judge me by thy strength. For strangers are risen up against me’; and in Proverbs: ‘The name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it, and is safe’; and in the Second Book of Samuel: ‘I will call on the Lord, who is worthy to be praised: so shall I be saved from mine enemies.’

Now there is a very well-known story in the *Arabian Nights* which bears on all this: the story of Ali Baba. Ali Baba was a poor woodcutter, but one day when he was in the forest he heard the leader of a troop of horsemen say to a rock, ‘Open, Sesame!’ and at once a door opened in the rock and all the men went in. And when they came out again, he heard the leader say once more, ‘Shut, Sesame!’ and the door closed, and the rock was as before. When the men had ridden away, Ali Baba went himself to the rock, and said, ‘Open, Sesame!’ and behold the name was with power on his lips as well as on the leader’s, and the door opened, and Ali Baba passed in. Oh, the wealth he found there, the silver and the gold that had been laid up for ages! Ali Baba was rich now, as rich as the leader himself, for the magic name had made him welcome to everything. And that is what the name of Jesus does for us—it welcomes us to all that Jesus has Himself. There is nothing He has but He wants us to share too, when we are Christ’s, and are trusting in His Name.

Now Ali Baba could be rich and happy to the end of his days; never wanting anything so long as he had these stores of riches to go to, and so long as he remembered the name which had the power of opening the door to them. And neither will you want any good thing as long as the Name that is above every name is the Name you love above everything and every one.

But there is a sequel to this story. Ali Baba had a brother called Cassim. When he learned how Ali Baba came by his wealth, he determined to go to the cave in the rock and clear it out, and keep all the riches for himself. So he went with eleven mules—meaning to bring them back laden with gold, and when he came to the rock, and said, ‘Open, Sesame!’ the door swung open for him as for Ali Baba. But when he got inside and the door had closed upon him, the sight of all the wealth that was there stirred up in his heart such selfish, proud, and ambitious thoughts—thoughts about what a great man he would become, and what a grand house he would have, and what magnificent clothes he would

wear, and what dainty food he would eat—that he quite forgot the name which had the power. When he had gathered all together ready to put on the mules, he tried and tried and tried, but couldn’t remember the name that would open the door. He knew it was the name of some sort of grain, but which kind it was he couldn’t recall. He tried barley—‘Open, Barley!’ he said, but the door didn’t move. Then he tried the names of other seeds—oats, wheat, and so on; but the door would not open. None of these names had any power with them. So the miserable man perished in the midst of all the wealth he had coveted for himself.

That is a very interesting story, is it not? Yet it is more than a tale—it has a great lesson for us all. Just think! Why is the Name of Jesus so powerful? It is because the Name of Jesus is Love. That is the secret of its power. For the Name is not a kind of charm or incantation which would be effective whoever and however any one spoke it. Indeed, we often repeat this sacred Name to no purpose. We say it often in our prayers, and often in our hymns, and we may wonder why nothing happens—but it is just because we have not taken the *Power* of the Name into our lives. When we do that, when we put love and loving thoughts into our lives, then we shall learn how true it is that only by this Name, and by no other name, can the world to-day be saved.

‘Leerie.’

By THE REVEREND JOHN B. DAVIE, M.A., LEITH.

‘Let your light . . . shine . . .’—Mt 5¹⁴.

Directly opposite our house there is a street lamp, and one of the things my children loved to do was to go to the window on winter afternoons as dusk was falling, and watch for the lamplighter—‘Leerie,’ they called him—coming round to light the lamp. Probably some of you like to do that too. Nearly all young folk are interested in Leerie. Many years ago there was a little boy, who lived in Edinburgh, who was lucky enough to have a street lamp opposite his window, and used to watch every evening for the lamplighter. When he grew up, he became a famous writer and poet—Robert Louis Stevenson—and he wrote a poem about Leerie. Most of you probably know it:

My tea is nearly ready and the sun has left the sky;
It’s time to take the window to see Leerie going
by.

Some little boys want to be engine-drivers, and

some to be soldiers or sailors or policemen; but young Robert Louis Stevenson thought he would like to be a Leerie.

Now Tom would be a driver and Maria go to sea,
And my papa's a banker and as rich as he can be;
But I, when I am stronger, and can choose what
I'm to do,
O Leerie, I'll go round at night and light the lamps
with you!

Stevenson never became a lamplighter, and I don't suppose any of you will either; but all the same, I think it would be a fine ambition for any of us, just to try to do what Leerie does—go about the world lighting lamps and scattering light wherever we go.

For the world is a dark place for some folk, boys and girls—a place shadowed by sadness and suffering and hardship and disappointment; and it would be a great thing, wouldn't it, to be able to light a lamp here and there that would bring a little brightness into some shadowed life?

And there are so many lamps we all could light and keep burning! There is the lamp of cheerfulness. We all come up against little troubles that worry or annoy us at times, but it does no good to pull a long face or to make other people miserable about it. Keep smiling. A smiling face is like a ray of sunshine to sad hearts.

Then there is the lamp of kindness. Do you remember how, when men did the cruellest deed in history and nailed the Lord Jesus to the Cross, darkness fell over all the land. There is a little parable in that fact. When we do unkind, cruel, selfish things, it always darkens the world. But every time we do a kind and helpful action, it makes everything brighter not only for those we help, but even for ourselves.

I'm sure there are lots of others you can think of—the lamp of courage, the lamp of truth, and many others. Keep them shining in your life, and the world will be a brighter and happier place for your having lived.

The story is told of Spurgeon, the great preacher, that late one afternoon he was walking up Norwood Hill in London with a friend. Some distance ahead of them, moving up the same steep incline, they could see a lamplighter, lighting lamp after lamp, until he disappeared over the top of the hill. Turning to his friend, Spurgeon said:

'I hope my life will be just like that. I should like to think that when I've gone over the brow of the hill, I shall leave lots of lights shining behind me.'

Wasn't that a fine thought, boys and girls? Could you and I have any higher ambition than just this—so to live that we shall leave lots of lights shining in lives made brighter and better and happier for having known us? But if we are to do that, then our own hearts must be lit with love to the Lord Jesus, and there is only One who can kindle that flame in us—He who is the Light of the World. Let us try to be like Him and loyal to Him in all our ways, and let us ask Him day by day to help us to be brave and loving and kind. Then we too shall be lamplighters, and leave lots of lights shining behind us.

The Christian Year.

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Christian Rule of Life.

'Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's.'—Mt 22²¹.

Every reformer must be met by such criticism as came to our Lord. What are you going to do really? What is your meaning behind your fine speeches about the rights of man, or the right to work, or a living wage, or justice? Or, what is your theory of the relations between Church and State? How far should private morality govern nations? Who is to decide in the long run what a man may do or may not do—the individual, or the State, or the Church? If the time is out of joint, how do you propose to set it right? And, if your views are carried out, what will become of what people call vested interests and cherish so carefully? Or, what will become of the ordinary root morality—that which we believe has been the true basis of the State—if your theories of liberty have scope?

Something of an answer to all these questions may surely be found in Christ's reply to that question of temptation so politely introduced and so ensnaringly framed.

Our Lord never answered a question, as we read the gospel record, simply as if it were a thing of present interest, some difficulty that had momentarily arisen, and could be settled and done with. He always views every question, in the old phrase, *sub specie æternitatis*. So when we ask what are our duties towards society, we must ask with our thought also on what are our duties towards God; because we cannot live one side of life rightly unless we live the other side rightly also. 'Render there-

fore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's ; and unto God the things that are God's.'

There are two kinds of people in the world, those who think that the world exists for them, and those who know that they themselves exist only as part of something immeasurably vast and great. Nowhere do we see the difference more plainly than when we look at young people beginning a life for which they have just become fully responsible. But the choice recurs again and again all through life. Is the world a great store out of which one goes and takes what one wants ? Or is it a stupendous system whose Maker and Builder is God. How well it was said by a great American Bishop, 'To one man God is a vast means working for his comfort ; to another man God is a vast end to which his powers strive to make their contribution.'

We shall never make anything of life or of any work or part in it, scholarship, music, painting, history, or even criticism, unless we take the second view and relate what we have to do to something far greater than what is already in existence.¹

Duty to God is the standard and the test. It is first and foremost ; all else in life circles and gathers round it. God is above Cæsar ; nay, if we render to Cæsar it is because we render to God. 'Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's ; and unto God the things that are God's.'

There seem points in Christianity which rather connect it with anarchism than with constituted authority—its unflinching criticism of social conditions, its demand for justice, and its undying hatred of injustice, its indignation against oppression and wickedness in high places, its sympathy and tenderness with the oppressed and outcast. The gospel is a social message, a proclamation of the rights of the poor and weak, and it might be thought almost to give an excuse for revolution. Also, the loyalty it demands for 'another King, one Jesus' seems to lift its followers above all lower judicatories. It proclaims the spiritual independence which makes a man free from outside interference. There was a temptation in early times, as there is still in all times of high feeling and spiritual vision, to despise the inferior power of the State, and make a man a law to himself. Antinomianism is a heresy which insidiously dogs the heels of spiritual religion. When we say rightly that the spiritual man alone can be the judge of spiritual things, it seems an easy step to go further and say that the spiritual man can refuse to be judged of any in any sphere.

Apart from such extravagances of Christian freedom, there have been times when insurrection has

been a sacred duty in the interests of the social order itself, as well as in the interests of freedom and the higher life of man. There have been times when true men are called to obey God rather than men. It is said of a philosopher who was disputing with Augustus Cæsar that at a stage in the dispute he began to weaken in his argument. When asked afterwards the reason, he replied, 'Would you have me contend with the master of thirty legions ?' There have been times when no such graceful concession has been possible for Christians, when they have been driven by the imperative of conscience to contend at all costs and stand firm against all powers of earth, against Cæsar and his thirty legions.

At the same time the divine right of the State in its true sense is upheld and enforced in the Christian teaching. Some organization of society is necessary for the moral order of things, and so the Christian faith in practice has been the strongest bulwark of the authority of the State, that men may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. Constituted authority has rights over us by virtue of our existence. The social order is of God : law and its representatives have their source of power in God ; and it is the duty of Christians to give honour and willing obedience in so far as conscience permits. This is a lesson of our Lord's own life, who came not as a revolutionary and advocated no political propaganda, and who pointed to duty to God as the great standard and test of all life.

The text may be read not only as a plea for obedience to lawful authority and the recognition of the supremacy of the State, but also as a plea for active interest in public affairs by all who have pledged themselves as citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven. This is especially so in a democracy, when government after all is the embodiment of the people's will, when it is representative of ourselves. If we blame it, we have only ourselves to blame. It has claims on us : we have duties towards it, and what have we done to make the kingdoms of this world the Kingdom of God and His Christ ? If we complain of civic or national government, if we lament about public life or social needs or reforms or the want of reforms, if we sneer about politics as a game, a sphere for personal ambitions, whose is the fault ? The responsibility for the State, the law, politics, and social conditions is ours. The gospel is concerned with soul first, but the life that is offered to God must spend itself in the service of men.¹

So when we think truly of Cæsar, we must think

¹ W. H. Hutton, *A Disciple's Religion*, 194.

¹ H. Black, *According to my Gospel*, 258.

truly of God. We cannot serve man truly unless we serve God too. So true is it, as Crashaw said :

All we have is God's, and yet
Cæsar challenges a debt ;
Nor hath God a thinner share,
Whatever Cæsar's payments are.

We cannot serve God truly, unless we serve man too. If that is a commonplace now, it is Jesus Christ who made it so.

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

Jehovah-Tsidkenu.

'The Lord our righteousness.'—Jer 23^o.

'Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us . . . righteousness.'—1 Co 1^o.

Righteousness of the requisite standard is not humanly attainable, but a name like this puts us on the way to its ultimate possession. Jeremiah uses the name on two occasions and in different references. On the first occasion it is the name of the ideal king—'This is his name whereby he shall be called, Jehovah-Tsidkenu'; the second time he uses it, it is the name of the ideal city or kingdom—'This is the name wherewith she shall be called, Jehovah-Tsidkenu.'

The ideal king is portrayed as being perfectly righteous in character, and as promoting righteousness throughout his realm. The ideal city or kingdom is depicted as being righteous altogether in its citizens and in all its conditions of life. However difficult or apparently impossible the attainment of righteousness may be, the conscience of man has long felt that it is righteousness that exalts a nation, and that righteousness is the ideal state of being.

When Dr. Alexander Whyte died he was described as the last of the great old race of preachers of righteousness. Those preachers of righteousness were in truth a great old race, Elijah, Isaiah, Amos, Jeremiah, Paul, Calvin, and others with them. They were men who preached righteousness as those who sought it for themselves above all recognition or reward, and as those who sought it for their society and generation as the true foundation of security and peace. They knew that perfect righteousness is of God and must be God-given; they had a profound sense of God, and preached and lived as if God were behind them and beside them. They were like men with an extra sense, a sense of sight and sound and smell and touch and taste, and, above all, a sense of God.

In *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, Barth

wrote: 'The deepest longing in us is born of the deepest need: oh that Thou wouldest rend the heavens, that Thou wouldest come down! Oppressed and afflicted by his own unrighteousness and the unrighteousness of others, man—every man—lifts up from the depths of his nature the cry for righteousness, the righteousness of God. [Whoever understands him at this point understands him wholly. Whoever can reach a hand to him here, can really help him. This is the reason why such prophets as Moses, Jeremiah, and John the Baptist are figures never to be erased from the memory of humanity. They uncovered to men their deepest need; they made articulate their conscience within them; they awakened and kept awake the longing within them for the righteousness of God. They prepared the way of the Lord.]'

1. The texts set before us the final and ultimate *standard of righteousness*. It has been urged that where numbers of men are gathered together they have the right to agree among themselves as to what things may or may not be. In other words, they have the right to erect a standard of morality approved by themselves and adapted to their needs. But the world needs more than a number of nations living according to their separate standards.

There are some things that we may fix for ourselves, laws of local societies and institutions, wages and working hours. But there are some things that are fixed for us: the rising and setting of sun and moon, the ebb and flow of ocean tides, the coming and going of the wind, the rotation of day and night, seedtime and harvest, summer and winter; and in the spiritual world as in the natural there is somewhere an absolute standard as fixed as the sun, where right is right and wrong is wrong, and nothing can by any means mix them.

2. This name that the prophet gives to the ideal king and the ideal state raises the further question as to the *source of righteousness*. Manifestly it is not found in ourselves; not alone because the Scriptures say so, but because our own hearts say so. 'None of us has strength to rise,' confessed Seneca. 'Oh, that someone would stretch out a hand.'

'To will,' the Apostle Paul cried, 'is present with me: but how to perform that which is good I find not.' Long and patiently he practised the plan of the Pharisees to attain righteousness. Sometimes he thought he had it or almost had it, yet it eluded the grasp of his eager fingers; then after repeated failure he abandoned the quest because he had found some better way. 'That I may be found in him, not having mine own righteousness . . . but

that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith.'

'What should I do,' exclaimed Thomas Chalmers, 'were it not that it is written, "Christ died for the ungodly." Never am I in a better frame than when dwelling in simple faith on Christ's offered righteousness, and making it the object of my acceptance.'

That was where John Bunyan found the resting-place of his heart. 'One day as I was passing into the field, and that too with some dashes on my conscience, fearing lest yet all was not right, suddenly this sentence fell upon my soul, Thy righteousness is in heaven, and methought withal I saw, with the eyes of my soul, Jesus Christ at God's right hand. There, I say, was my righteousness, so that wherever I was or whatever I was doing, God could not say of me He wants my righteousness, for that was just before Him. I also saw, moreover, that it was not my good frame of heart that made my righteousness better, nor yet my bad frame that made my righteousness worse, for my righteousness was Jesus Christ Himself, the same yesterday and to-day and for ever.'

3. The name has this further content, that it reveals to us the *secret of righteousness*. Martin Luther has discussed four kinds of righteousness. There is a political righteousness, that which implies obedience to the laws of the State and the principles of good citizenship; there is a certain ceremonial righteousness, which is attained by the observance of certain forms of ritual; there is also a certain legal righteousness which is obtained by a due regard to the Mosaic Law, and the explicit commandments of God; and there is a moral and spiritual righteousness which belongs to the inward life, as against these other purely external conditions of being.

Outward forms will not command the inward state, but the inward life can command the outward form. 'The Lord our righteousness,' not the standard only, not a substitute merely, but the secret of being in which a completely new manner of life becomes an actuality.

This righteousness which Christ creates and cultivates in our experience is above the level of merely customary ways of living; it means a quality of life that is not subject to human opinion and fashion, nor accommodated to the spirit of the time.

Christ is the secret of that righteousness in every rank and level of life. He kept His own soul unspotted from the world; no life was ever more roughly handled or more severely buffeted or more persistently tempted, but He yielded at no point,

and He is to troubled and tempted souls the strength and courage of righteousness. He is the inward motive and constraint of all those who make it the supreme business of their life, by all the aids that heaven lends to serious men, to practise the righteousness that approves itself unto God.

4. If the Lord is our righteousness we can possess a remarkable *serenity* about present and ultimate things. He will suffice for all time, present and future, and for all conditions. Men who have lived and died seeking this one prize, believed in it, though it eluded them. Though they died before they attained it, they believed in it as if they were sure they would take up its quest again on the other side of death; and if there were other worlds to conquer, they would conquer them too, and at last come to that promised righteousness, 'When we see him we shall be like him.' 'Henceforth,' cried one who joined in this quest with all his heart, 'Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.' The prospect was both peace and power to his life.

'The crown of righteousness,' Florence Nightingale said, 'that word always strikes me more than anything in the Bible. It is strange that it was not happiness Paul wanted; not rest, not forgiveness, not glory that was the thought of that glorious man's mind, when, at the end of the last and greatest of his labours, all desires were so swallowed up in the one craving after righteousness that, at the end of all his struggles, it was mightier within him than ever, mightier even than the desire for peace.'¹

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Coming of the Kingdom.

'If any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there; believe it not.'—Mt 24²³.

A warning. Sufficiently impressive, one might think, but strangely disregarded. At all times in the history of Christianity there have been men who would point to the immediate coming of Christ, with particularity of time and place; at all times they have had deluded followers, and the shame of repeated disappointment seems to be no hindrance. Some of us can remember startling examples of this kind of prediction. How shall we account for it?

There was in the days of the gospel a vague

¹ J. Macbeath, *What is His Name?*, 113.

expectation, hope or fear, of a great catastrophe which should usher in the Kingdom of God. This was general; but some reduced the vagueness to precise detail, and wrote exact predictions of varied character. Their writings were what we now call eschatological, teaching about the end of the world. The Lord Jesus, in declaring that the Kingdom of God was at hand—which is the first meaning of the gospel, the Good News—did not brush aside these expectations, or even these predictions. He made use of them as imagery of the truth which He had to impart. There was no difficulty about this for one who habitually taught by parables. We shall come back presently to the truth which was so taught, but we must first remind ourselves that almost all the disciples of our Lord had been in the habit of taking that imagery as reality, an exact description of things that were actually going to happen. The result was that two currents of thought continued to run side by side. To take a familiar example, the imagery is treated as prediction of actual fact in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians: 'The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the triumph of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.' The writer of that description was perhaps Silvanus, St. Paul's companion, but it was written with St. Paul's approval; and five or six years afterwards something of the same sort was written, with greater sobriety, in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, which was certainly St. Paul's own. But alongside of this we also find something of a different kind; not prediction of an end to come, but recognition of an end that has arrived. The stories of the Old Testament were written, says St. Paul, 'for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the world are come.' That became the conviction of the Apostolic Church. 'Little children, it is the last time,' wrote St. John. Nay, what he wrote is more emphatic: 'It is the latest hour.' This way of looking at the end finds its completion in the Book of the Revelation of John. The sense of the book is that there is much yet to happen, but that even now it is the time of the end; the judgment is set, and the books are opened.

How did the Church come to this consciousness of the end as actually present? We must go back to the personal teaching of the Lord Jesus. Using the eschatological imagery of the time, He led men away from the habit of taking it for reality. They were not anxiously to scan the future, 'for, behold,

the kingdom of God is within you.' Perhaps the words mean rather 'in your midst,' but the sense remains the same, for this kingdom is invisible to eyes that look on outward things. He proclaimed the immediate coming of the Kingdom; men then living should see its coming. How and when, then, did the Kingdom come?

A careful reading of the Gospel will give the answer. At first Jesus proclaims in the most general terms that the Kingdom is at hand. Then there is a limit of time fixed; the Kingdom was to come in the lifetime of men then living. But still, the day and the hour no man knows. But at last the Son knows the day and the hour, and declares it. You have the declaration of Jesus before Caiaphas. 'Now and from this time onward ye shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.' Here is something future, but also a present reality. The Evangelists who recorded the prediction of the Kingdom within that generation recorded also this more tremendous affirmation. He who made the affirmation was soon to hang on the Cross, and there the robber pleaded for remembrance when the Kingdom should come. But the answer brushed aside the hope of an uncertain future: 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' The Lord spoke as reigning king, lifted up on the Cross against the clouds of heaven—and Caiaphas saw. Saw what? Who shall say? There is a prophecy quoted as apt: 'They shall look on him whom they pierced.' Did He see beyond? But even the faithful who saw were slow to understand, and even after the Resurrection they still teased the Master with questions about the times and seasons of the Kingdom. The old answer was given once more: the Father has put these things in His own power; but then there was a promise: 'Ye shall receive power'—it is not the same word in the Greek, but the connexion seems obvious—'after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.' The Holy Ghost came, and Peter at once declared the meaning of it, as spoken by Joel the prophet: 'It shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh.' In the last days! These men were they upon whom the ends of the world were come. In the light of the Resurrection they saw and understood the Cross, the coming of Christ into His Kingdom; and they proclaimed it. 'Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.'

And yet we pray, 'Thy kingdom come!' and the language of futurity has never ceased. At the end

of the Apostolic Age men were querulously asking, 'Where is the promise of His coming?' It was necessary to warn them that, although they were indeed living in the last day, yet the Day of the Lord may well outlast a thousand years of man's reckoning. There is still a future: the completion of the Day. But the Day is here, and we are living in it. Our eyes do see the establishment of the Kingdom, though not yet its final triumph. Our eyes do see the throne set, and judgment given. For it is the Day of Judgment in which we live. It is when Judgment becomes terrible that we are most aware of its presence; but present it is always, whether in the stirring of a single conscience or in the crash of an empire. The Kingdom present and Judgment present are not to be denied. They force themselves upon the Christian understanding, even when the tendency to futurity and expectancy is at the strongest. Our Advent hymns are almost inevitably controlled by that tendency, but the truth breaks through:

Great God, what do I see and hear!

It is the cry of a soul conscious of the Kingdom and of Judgment. And there is an answer no less conceived in terms of the present:

Lo, He comes in clouds descending.

The use of imagery is not obsolete. The meaning of the imagery is not completely realized, and until that be done, alike in thought and in action, the language of imagery will be a wholesome stimulant. But we must remember that it is imagery of the present as well as of the still veiled future. We must hold fast, with whatever difficulty, the consciousness of the Last Day, of the Kingdom come, in which the Church of the Apostles rejoiced and endured.

It is a general consciousness, common to the whole Church, however dimly illuminated. We are not to look for Christ here or there, in local or temporal manifestation: 'For as the lightning, that lighteneth out of the one part under heaven, shineth unto the other part under heaven, so shall also the Son of Man be in his day.' The Kingdom is in our midst, established in the universal Church of Christ; it is within us, where-soever Christ reigns in the hearts of the simple. 'I saw, and behold a white horse; and he that sat on him had a bow; and a crown was given unto him: and he went forth conquering and to conquer.'¹

¹ T. A. Lacey, in *Advent and Christmas Sermons*, 65.

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Gospel according to the Enemies of Jesus.

'We know that thou art true.'—Mt 22¹⁴.

'This man doeth many miracles.'—Jn 11⁴⁷.

'This man receiveth sinners.'—Lk 15².

'He saved others; himself he cannot save.'—Mt 27⁴².

Of all that can be declared concerning Jesus Christ our Lord this is possibly the most unexpected and surprising, that it was His enemies who actually said the most acutely perceptive and invitingly glorious things about Him. The extent of their testimony, taken together, is such that it actually comprises the entire gospel in its essential facts and features.

Of course, at the time, the things His avowed foes said of Him were intended for contemptuous and venomous insults. But, even so, they spoke more truly than they knew; as most people do when they set forth anything they see in Him. A man's friends, as we all know, may be biased in his favour. What they say of him may be sheer partisanship, suspected on that very account as enthusiastic overstatement. But not so his determined enemies. The bitter opponents of Jesus Christ were all unconscious that one day their scornful taunts would become the triumphant proclamations of His followers.

It was one of them who said: 'We know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth. In contrast the time-serving custodians and teachers of conventional religion with whose ways we are only too well acquainted, we know that thou regardest not the persons of men.' What an unintended tribute to the moral perfection of His life! It was this that authenticated the credibility of His teaching beyond all reach of denial and disproof. His ways and His words were woven of one piece. He was Himself the supreme commendation of His doctrine. With every desire in the world to discredit Him no man was able to convict Him of sin. His life set then, as it has set ever since, a standard in the conduct of men's inescapable relationships, Godward and world-ward, which arraigned every man at the bar of his own conscience, and forced him to an acknowledgment of guilty shortcoming. Jesus Christ was then, as He is still, Himself the convincing evidence of the absoluteness of His claim that He had come from God. No other explanation fitted the facts of His life. Nor ever will.

On the testimony of His enemies, then, we, with our need of final truth on which to build, and by

which to guide life, may individually rely with confidence upon Jesus Christ. He is God's full and final word to this world. He is the Truth.

Then it was a crafty and determined enemy, in a dilemma into which His activities had forced the ecclesiastical authorities of His day, who declared: 'This man doeth many miracles.'

Unlike some of those who set out to make the Christian religion acceptable to the modern mind by eliminating Christ's miracles from its reliable records, His foes of that time did not attempt to deny them or to explain them away. That line of attack they knew to be of no use whatever. And if Christianity is not miraculous, superhuman and supernatural, it is nothing. Nor has it anything of effective help for sinful, incapacitated man. For, apart from Christ's power to do the humanly impossible for and in those who confide in Him, what hope is there for the recreation of sin-wrecked and ruined lives?

His miracles, attested by His enemies, are the epitome of those processes of grace by which He meets the deep needs and liabilities of our human nature. They are acted parables of His might. In the stories of lepers cleansed, of devils dispossessed, of tempests stilled, of hungry crowds fed, of paralytics vitalized, of elements transmuted, we see Him at work in circumstances which answer to our own present moral and spiritual situations. And what a gospel is this! That the Christ with whom we have to do, who seeks us down the devious ways of life to which we have turned, does in these very situations 'many miracles'! Our deranged and deteriorated capacities may be renewed! Our tastes and dispositions may be changed! Our lost things may be restored to us, and to the services for which they were divinely entrusted to us!

We may take it from His antagonists that He actually did miracles before them which, in sheer self-interest, they would have pooh-poohed out of existence if they could. We may take it from Himself direct that neither in this respect nor in any other has He changed one whit.

Another group who sought to blight His reputation and to inflame active disfavour against Him by playing upon popular prejudice said: 'This man receiveth sinners and eateth with them! He actually goes the length of making the hated tax-farmers His friends! Every one is aware that a man is known by the company he keeps. We know of what sort these people are with whom He consorts. He's no better than they are!'

And all unwittingly, by the implied slander, these too proclaim His undying glory. For if anything

is true of Him it is this—that He is the friend and brother of those who have failed and fallen and cannot rise. Mark that neither condonation of their sin, nor extenuation of their failure, nor condemnation of themselves, does He ever suggest. It is not in any such fruitless way that He befriends men. Simply He offers the help of One who entirely understands their nature. One who estimates to an ounce the weight of the temptation which has overborne them. One who knows their secret battles and defeats and remorse. One who loves them and whose love will go to all lengths and stop short at no sacrifice in order to serve their interests and the glory of God which is bound up with them. The aim of His friendship, which is the greatest reality in all life to those who welcome it, is to uplift and transfigure them into ever-increasing likeness to what God intended them, from the beginning, to be. And the possibility of such a life Jesus Christ sees in the unlikeliest.

When the full story of this age of scientific accomplishment comes to be written, one of the most amazing wonders to be chronicled will be the achievement of synthetic chemistry which, from the black, unpromising, unbeautiful by-products of coal-gas manufacture, has evolved the most exquisitely coloured dyes, the most potent drugs, the most reliable disinfectants and antiseptics, the richest sweetening substances, and the most fragrant perfumes. It used to be said that, 'You can't touch pitch without being defiled!' Now, since the magician's wand has passed over it, it is truer to say that you can't touch it without being enriched! And when it has been told as it deserves to be told, that story from the book of natural science is simply a parable of the mighty transformation effected in the life of that man who accepts the overtures of the Friend of sinners. He's the Friend of sinners! His enemies said it! His friends—a motley lot—know it and glory in it!

The malignity and hatred which dogged His footsteps throughout His life were not silenced even when their aim had apparently been accomplished. As He hung upon the shameful tree, His enemies cried: 'He saved others! Himself he cannot save!' They remembered Mary, out of whom He had cast seven devils; and Matthew; and Zacchæus; and the sons of Zebedee; and Bartimæus; and Lazarus; and many another. Beyond all cavil He had saved them. It would have been futile, in face of what the populace knew, to deny it, though it was little these disdainful scoffers realized of the content and meaning of the term they used. And it was altogether beyond

their comprehension that the fact with which they taunted Him: 'Himself he cannot save' attests for all time the redeeming reality of the Everlasting Love of which He was the supreme expression. Obtuse though they were, they had unconsciously hit upon the profoundest truth in all the philosophy of helpfulness as well as in the entire episode of the world's salvation. For there is no other way, there never has been, of saving others than by losing one's own life.

On the occasion of the Garibaldi Centenary in 1907, *The Times* leading article contained these words: 'A statesman of genius may secure our admiration; a loyal king our passionate loyalty; a prophet our eager acquiescence, and, in times of crisis, the obedience of our will. But it is the man who is willing to die for us that wins our love.'¹

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Twelve Gates.

'On the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west three gates . . . every several gate was of one pearl.'—Rev 21^{13, 21}.

'And the city had twelve gates.' These words are a call to a great charity, a great catholicity, in our Christian experience. There are many varieties of that experience, and we dare not claim that ours is the only true and valid one.

One still meets the unwarrantable assertion that the gateway of the Church is the only entrance into God's everlasting Kingdom. To this view the Roman Church clings tenaciously. Our forefathers sternly contested it. In this we would follow them.

Another familiar assertion to which many cling stubbornly is that unless one can state with precision the day and hour of one's conversion, one cannot claim to have entered into the Kingdom which is everlasting. In support of this view the classic example of St. Paul has been cited. But was that conversion so sudden as it seems? We must not forget that Paul was born a Jew, which means he had learned to revere Jehovah who ruled in glory, and whose power was manifest throughout the earth. Paul, too, was a Pharisee brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, and therefore had profound and solemn reverence for the law of Moses. The young man who conforms to the Ten Commandments is not far from the Kingdom of God. Once more, Paul was familiar with Greek culture, which emancipated his intellect from the narrowness of Jewish tradi-

tion. Recall, too, that he was one of those who stood by consenting to the death of the first Christian martyr. He was among the men who saw Stephen looking upward in the last hour of his earthly life, calling upon God to lay not this sin to the charge of his murderers. His conversion was not so sudden as it seemed.

We must remember that behind many decisions there may be unrecorded preparation. Nor must we forget that very many enter the Kingdom of God without apparent effort. They open their lives to higher influences as flowers open to the sun. Their Christian life conforms to the law of growth.

In his fascinating vision of the future Kingdom, John saw that into it from every side of life there are gateways. The symbolism of the twelve gates is almost inexhaustible. But in the first place they remind us that *all peoples and races shall come to the Lord Jesus Christ*. The names of all the tribes are writ above. There is no social problem and no racial problem when we meet at last around the throne of God, Jew and Gentile, men of the North and the South and the East and the West, rich and poor, black and white, brown and yellow—what a Pentecostal commingling of hearts and voices when the one Eternal Father pours out His Spirit upon all flesh! Here is the promise of the perfect democracy, the true brotherhood of man, the last and greatest League of Nations. We may see in this vision a great call to support our missions, both at home and abroad, that the light of the gospel may be shed into every dark corner of the world.

Again, the thought of the twelve gates should give us a new conception of Christian unity. It is a narrow and ignorant creed that wastes its strength in self-pride and barren controversy, declaring that it alone has the keys to the presence chamber. As a matter of fact there are no keys in human hands. The gates are flung wide open, and though at each an angel sentry stands, we smile at the very thought that the parleying for admittance will be concerned with fine points of ecclesiastical polity or theological niceties of doctrine. Far different will that questioning be, searching out the deep things of the soul. When Christian and his companion, in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, went up to the gate, there was written over it in letters of gold: 'Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.'

But the other, the grim side of the picture, is found in the closing verse of this same chapter. 'And there shall in no wise enter into it anything that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomina-

¹ J. S. Holden, *A Voice for God*, 77.

tion, or maketh a lie: but they which are written in the Lamb's book of life.'

We might pursue, almost indefinitely, this metaphor of the twelve gates, the different methods of approach by which men come at last to God. *We may think of it in terms of age.* Those pressing in at the East gate are they who accept Christ in early youth, when the sun is just rising upon their life.

'They that seek me early shall find me.' In days when Communism is Christianity's fiercest competitor, the Church must exert herself strenuously to lay her hand in guiding benediction upon the children, claiming them for Christ. Parents do well to remember that the easiest portals through which little ones may pass into the Kingdom of God are before them now in early impressionable years. 'On the east there are three gates.' We are either making it easier or more difficult for them to enter through these gates into the Kingdom of God.

From the South flock those who make the great decision in the noontime of their years. Others, again, come to the Saviour of men when the shadows lengthen in the West, at the sunset hour. And finally there are those who find salvation only by the North gate, when the winter storms begin, and human life is dying in mist and cold.

Or we might let our imaginations play over the various types of mind which grow together into the supreme and final truth. The Eastern gate is that of mysticism and introspection. The Western is that of practical service and humanitarian zeal. From the North comes the rugged intellectual fervour for doctrine which gave Calvinism so great a hold upon our Scottish Church. And through the South gate enters the mind ripened by the warm sunshine of affection and of love.¹

East, North, South, West, there are gateways

¹ T. B. S. Thomson, *The Quest of Youth*, 43.

into the Kingdom of God. No person is barred, no nation is excluded. Right round and through the whole world of human experience there are set before us open doors which no man can shut. At the twenty-first verse of the chapter the words occur, 'the twelve gates were twelve pearls; each one of the several gates was of one pearl.' Whence came the idea? The writer had loved his Master well, and once he heard Him say, 'The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a merchantman seeking goodly pearls. And when he had found one pearl of great price he went and sold all he had and bought it.' And the men addressed said to one another: 'That is precisely what we have done. We have given up all we counted dear; we have surrendered our pearls of joy and comfort for him. But in him we have discovered the pearl of great price.' And so in later years, a devoted disciple was stirred in the loneliness of exile to share his thrilling vision of the City of God in which we enter through gates of pearl. Whether it be the East, the North, the South, or the West, the gate is always 'the pearl of great price,' it is always Jesus Christ. He meets us at every turn of life. He meets us in every vicissitude, for His is a love that follows hard after us and will not let us go. It is through Him, and through Him alone, that we enter into the Kingdom of God. And we can do it now. Moreover, if that word applies to individual men and women it applies no less to nations to-day. Amid international discord and confusion; amid dark and grievous misunderstandings, Jesus stands before the Eastern and the Northern, and the Southern and the Western nations, the undismayed champion of human values. When shall we emphasize to the world that Jesus is its light and its life, that only through Him can come emancipation from everything that hampers growth of brotherhood? This is the function of His Church.²

² W. E. Blackburn, *Christ shows the Way*, 22.

The Eighth Commandment.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., D.Th., LONDON.

THE basis of society in the Hebrew nation was *theocratic* and not *sociocratic*; moral obligations were recognized as divine commands, and the sanction was the authority of God and not of the

State. In the second group of the Decalogue, dealing with man's relation to his fellows, there is a progressiveness in the demands made. The bond of the family comes before any general social

obligations; the preservation of life comes before the protection of marriage; and these claims are more primitive than the assertion of the rights of property. Such a command as, 'Thou shalt not steal' assumes a more developed society, and even a more advanced economic order than the three preceding commands do. None of these three natural relations, and the obligations they involve, seems to need vindication as do the rights of property here assumed; and to offer this vindication must be our first task.

(1) Man creates nothing; God alone is Creator; God provides the material objects, which man appropriates, applies, and adapts to meet his physical necessities. It is God who sends the sunshine and the showers which make the earth fruitful. But man can make his own, use and enjoy only by his labour what God gives. Our Lord saw God's care and bounty towards all His creatures in the feeding of the birds of the air and the clothing of the flowers of the field; but in forbidding anxiety, and requiring trust in the Heavenly Father, He was not denying the need, or depreciating the value of human labour; for His parables show how constant and varied was His interest in the works of men in the home, the field, the sea (Mt 6²⁵⁻³⁴). But if 'the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; the world, and they that dwell therein' (Ps 24¹), how can man claim to possess anything as his own, as his exclusive property?

(2) The fact of man's labour affords one answer. It has been generally maintained that a man has a right to claim as his property that with which he has 'mixed his labour'; a hunter may keep the game he has killed, a farmer the crops he has raised, a shepherd the sheep he has tended. But this at once raises a problem. As long as there is land enough in which to hunt, to till, or to graze sheep, difficulty need not arise; but if the natural provision is falling short of the human demands, exclusive possession by one man means privation imposed on others. There arise quarrels and even fightings between rival claimants (cf. Gn 26¹⁸⁻²²); in an early stage of social development might was right; what was seized was held by the stronger hand. As there was progress, differences got adjusted, and exclusive possession was recognized and protected by law. Property as exclusive legally recognized possession of wealth—the material objects which meet human needs, or gratify human desires—may be transferred to another in exchange of services or goods, or by gift or bequest; in many countries some payment has to be made to

the State in recognition that the community gives to possession its security, as well as that in a civilized society no wealth is merely an individual product, but always due to co-operation with others. The ground on which many moralists condemn betting and gambling is that the transfer of wealth here has not the moral justification of advantageous exchange of goods or services, or of a voluntary expression of interest or affection in gift or bequest.

(3) It is quite evident that there is now very little wealth in a civilized society that is held for the reason that the owner has himself bestowed such labour on material objects as to give them their value for human use. But the stability of a society now requires that present possession be legally recognized and protected, unless it can be proved that it was acquired, not in the remote past but the immediate present, by force, falsehood, or fraud; and then restitution may be required. Just as for the two reasons already suggested, the transfer of wealth may be taxed, so also the consideration of the common good may override the individual claim, and the community, through its appropriate organ the State, may take possession of private property with compensation to the owner. As it is society which guarantees and preserves the possession, so society may determine the conditions of ownership, to prevent abuse and to promote the use, which the general interest demands. Among peasantry in some countries, with whom ancient traditions and customs survive long after they have been forgotten by city-dwellers, the old justification for property reappears in a distinction as regards moral wrong between reaping part of a field, and taking crops already reaped, felling a tree and carrying away wood already cut. It may here be stated generally that till recently, in most countries the rights of property have been protected against the demands of humanity; and if existing distress and discontent are to be removed, and righteousness in social relations is to be done, the State will need to intervene much more energetically than it has done to prevent the abuse of private property to public injury, and to allow such use only as is consistent with justice to all.

(4) Before pursuing this principle further, however, it is necessary to consider a moral justification for private property which has been advanced by idealists. Man is embodied spirit, or inspired body, and through his body he is related to the material universe, dependent on it for his physical safety and satisfaction; but he has a spiritual relation to it also; it is by understanding Nature's

laws that he can control Nature's forces to prevent injury or to promote benefit to himself; and this inquiry he can carry beyond all utilitarian ends to a disinterested pursuit of truth; he can appreciate and imitate Nature's beauty; in his efforts, individual and in co-operation with others, thus to subdue Nature for the common human good, he develops moral qualities and social relations; it is not apart from, but in relation to the material universe that he advances in culture and civilization. He can thus expand his personality in putting Nature to his human uses; he can maintain his independence, preserve himself from anxiety regarding his provision for future needs, find leisure for realizing his ideals, only as by an adequate possession of material goods he can be assured of his physical safety and satisfaction. Man's creative genius impels him to realize himself, not in his own personality alone, but in the world around him, the holding and shaping of things to his heart's desire. This *sounds* ideal, but it is *not* actual. As regards many of the *haves* it is an illusion, as regards the *have-nots* it is a mockery. The distribution of wealth to-day is such that at the one end of the scale there is a soul-destroying luxury, at the other a no less soul-destroying poverty. That in each class there are many, and among the poor probably more proportionately than among the rich, who rise above their circumstances, and realize their personality according to God's purpose, does not disprove the tendency, in abundance or in penury, to deteriorate and not develop manhood. Our Lord Himself regarded riches as more dangerous to the life which is life indeed, than poverty (Mt 10^{23, 24}, Lk 6^{20, 21} 16¹⁹⁻²⁶). What is certain, however, is that the Heavenly Father meant all His children to be fed, clothed, sheltered, cared for, comforted, so that there would be no need of 'carking care' for any one of them (Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶). The economic system of to-day, in our and other industrialized lands, and the social order which tolerates it, is an arrogant and defiant challenge of the divine purpose for the common human good.

(5) We must thus recognize that the society for the guidance of which this commandment was given was a much simpler one, in which the unity of the family and the solidarity of the tribe left relatively few unprovided for, and unprotected by the narrower or the wider community, and in which the problems of the distribution of wealth were not as acute as in our own day. We must have this economic and social background as we look more closely at the prohibition of theft. It is not neces-

sary to waste words on obvious transgressions of the commandment by the highwayman, the burglar, the pickpocket—these offences against the Law deserve punishment; but in assigning it account should be taken of the circumstances, the character, and the future possibilities of the thief. A starving man who steals a loaf, a father who is driven by the wants of his family to some fraud, a youth who can find no employment, and wants to relieve his family of a burden and breaks into a shop—these must all be punished, it may be, but far less guilty are they than the suburban woman who, without need, makes a practice of shop-lifting; and how many magistrates measure the legal penalty by the moral offence? This is not the place in which to discuss the large subject of penal reform; but not retribution or deterrence only should be regarded as the end of punishment, but reformation also. So far as theft is due, not to sheer wickedness, but to social wrong inflicted on the wrong-doer, by defect in the economic system, which withholds from a man the means of living, or even the chance of earning his living, society itself is the transgressor.

(6) But the prohibition 'Thou shalt not steal' has a much wider application to many moral offences, not all of which are so regarded. The company promoter, who issues a prospectus, which promises profits which can never be realized, and which there is no intention to make the effort to realize; the speculator in the stock-exchange 'bear' or 'bull' who manipulates the price of shares in his own interest with no regard to the actual condition of the company involved; the employer who pays his employees less than their labours are worth to him, taking advantage of their poverty, their dread of unemployment, or their helplessness because not protected by a trade union; the tradesman who puts in inferior material and work than he has undertaken to supply; the shopkeeper, who pretends that his goods are more valuable than the price he asks for them; the shopper who visits a shop only for bargains at a sale, and withholds her custom at other times; the government which inflates or deflates the currency for a party advantage, regardless of the effect on the community generally,—all these are, even if common custom condones any of their practices, *stealing*; they are gaining a personal advantage at a loss to others. Even the art of advertising and salesmanship, as widely practised in America—of getting people to buy goods that they did not need, and did not want until persuaded that they should want, because they needed them—is dishonest business.

In my judgment betting and gambling are also *theft*, a transfer of wealth without a proper equivalent in goods, services, or personal relations. It may not be possible to make all these offences crimes; but they should fall under moral condemnation. Many Christians need to have much more sensitive consciences; and most churches need to hold a much higher standard of conduct in these matters before their members and their community.

(7) Before we can suggest the Christian remedies we must more accurately diagnose the disease. Jesus affirmed that 'ye cannot serve God and mammon' (Mt 6²⁴); the desire for worldly possessions is a deep-rooted and strong passion. Men want to possess far beyond their necessities, comforts and luxuries even, for wealth gives social rank and influence, power to keep others in dependence, and so exercise an arbitrary control over them. Possession for rank or power is desired long after the need of possession for use has been more than satisfied. A far larger number are forced into the service of Mammon by anxiety for the supply of the necessities of self and others; family affection and solicitude may impose this bondage to gain the daily bread. Men live and labour in what has been truly described as 'an acquisitive society,' an economic system, in which self-interest is the too dominant motive, and competition the too prevalent method. Not only do its victims suffer physically and even often morally from 'the struggle for existence,' but even the victors have often to pay the price of a moral deterioration, of which many are still unaware, but of which a growing number are becoming sensitively conscious. 'Business is business' means for some Christian men, that they would be 'down and out' themselves, if they did not acquiesce in, not necessarily dishonest, but certainly harsh and cruel practices. If they tried to carry out the Golden Rule they feel that bankruptcy would be the result. Sometimes, if they did not lower wages, or dismiss some of their workers, they could not hold their own in the ruthless competition. All business is not as bad as that, but a great deal is. Mammon is a tyrannous master.

(8) For this morally dangerous situation in which the eighth commandment in its present applications is being widely disregarded the main reason is, that man's scientific and industrial progress has outrun his moral development. 'Knowledge comes, but wisdom lingers.' In morality which is not concerned solely with abstract general principles, but also with concrete particular instances, there must be a constantly fresh inter-

pretation and application of those principles to these instances as the circumstances make new demands. For the regulation of the economic system ethical principles in relevant interpretation and application are necessary; and Christian moralists have lagged behind in their reading of 'the signs of the times,' and have not developed a Christian ethic that will afford sure guidance. Not only so, but the application of ethical principles in the economic sphere has been challenged; in popular language the objection is worded; 'Business is business,' in more academic terms, 'the economic sphere is autonomous.' My space allows me to make only two remarks for which I could offer full justification. In the economic, as in every other sphere, there are regular sequences of cause and effect, actions have their inevitable consequences; but on closer scrutiny we discover that as in this sphere we are dealing with material objects on the one hand, and human activities on the other, such laws as there are can all be resolved into physical limitations, or psychic tendencies; of this reflexion the law of supply and demand offers a convincing illustration. These psychic tendencies—desires, motives, interests, purposes, actions—are all, as human, subject to moral law; as in all human life so in his making and using, selling and buying of material objects man is under moral obligations. The Christian Church has some responsibility not only for being so tardy in furnishing the relevant moral standard, but also for being so timid in proclaiming it, and exercising its authority in God's name to get it accepted and observed. While Lutheranism acquiesced in a dualism of the realm of grace and the social region, Calvinism aimed at bringing the whole of human life, individual and corporate, under the law of God, and as long as the Calvinistic churches maintained their discipline of the members, the authority of God's law was asserted. It was during last century that the churches abrogated their authority; and the tyranny of *individualism* with the consequent anarchy of *laissez-faire* became prevalent and dominant, with the inevitable result in the dangers and the difficulties of the present world-wide crisis.

(9) What, then, are some of the principles which the Church should proclaim? *First of all*, in face of the mechanization and materialization of human labour and life, which man's increased wealth due to his control over physical forces, and the resulting increasing productivity of modern methods of industry have brought about, it should proclaim that 'man doth not live by bread only, but by

every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of the Lord' (Dt 8³, Mt 4⁴), and that 'a man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth' (Lk 12¹⁵). Things and not persons are 'in the saddle' and hold the reins in the highly civilized communities. 'Plain living and high thinking,' not the converse, is the truth for the times; culture as the *worth* of mind should be master over civilization as the *wealth* of matter.

Secondly, the Golden Rule: 'all things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the law and the prophets' (Mt 7¹²)—this law of justice or righteousness, which is still less than the law of love, should be asserted; it is the *minimum*, not the *maximum*, demand on the Christian in all his relations with his fellows, including the economic.

Thirdly, Jesus' teaching about God's care for man's bodily needs (Mt 6²⁵⁻³⁴), His example in healing as well as preaching, His standard for the judgment of the nations (Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶) enforced as it is by His 'inasmuch' are surely a threefold cord which cannot be broken, binding the care of the body on the Christian conscience.

Fourthly, although owing to the economic conditions of His environment and age this care of the body was illustrated by instances of individual philanthropy, yet as Jesus was no legislator for a society such as Mohammed was, but left His Church the guidance of the Spirit under changed conditions, individual philanthropy may be quite inadequate to fulfil the obligation imposed. And it was under the guidance of the Spirit that during last century there developed, not instead of philanthropy which is still urgently needed, but as its necessary complement, to accomplish what it could not achieve, what has been called *social politics*, the provision by the community of a number of social services, the range of which is still expanding, where individual effort would be less efficient and less economical, even if at all practicable. A further step is now finding its advocates. The individualist, *laissez-faire* economic system has 'failed to deliver the goods' as the present crisis shows, that is, it has proved economically unsound, because, as some moralists have been proclaiming to deaf ears, till recently morally wrong in its dominant motive self-interest and its prevalent method competition; and any remedies which it has applied to itself have failed to cure its malignant disease. Some are advocating *collectivism*, not the abolition of private property for use, but the possession and control of

the means of production—capital—by the community, local or national. I am not prepared to commit myself to this general principle, as such a sudden change might prove a disastrous revolution, and wiser socialists do admit 'the inevitableness of gradualness.' It seems to me, however, unwise to commit oneself unreservedly to an abstract principle instead of leaving oneself free to judge what is best on each occasion, when some change is needed. I believe also in individual liberty, responsibility, initiative, and enterprise as a factor in economic as in all social developments worth preserving, so far as the interests of the community allow. To describe collectivist proposals, so long as just compensation is made, as theft, robbery, plunder, a violation of the commandment we are considering is sheer nonsense; as the rights of private property are not absolute, but always subject to the wider and higher interests of the common good. Wherever and whenever a necessary industry becomes a private monopoly, exploited for private gain at the loss of the community, some control, and if to that end necessary some possession, by the community is just and righteous. For by this change we are removing the occasion of, or the excuse for, a breach of the commandments.

Lastly, beyond the Golden Rule there is the law of love, which is in the strict use of language no law, but rather a motive, a disposition, a habit, a principle of manifold application, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself' (Mt 22³⁹). This commandment Jesus illustrates in the parables of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10³⁰⁻³⁷), the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16¹⁹⁻²⁶) and the Sheep and the Goats (Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶). The supreme instance and motive is His confession. 'The Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many' (Mt 20²⁸). He did not measure His intentions by His expectations from others, for love goes beyond even the Golden Rule, and He even in His love went beyond the law of love, equal for self and neighbour, for He gave His life to save all men. Paul, after reciting some of the commandments, offers the comment: 'Love worketh no ill to his neighbour' (Ro 13¹⁰); that may be the fulfilment of the Law as prohibition; it is not love's own fulfilment as service and sacrifice. To withhold benefit is often to inflict injury. To deprive any man of the provision God as Father makes for the needs of all His children by any abuse of the rights of property is from the standpoint of Christian love a violation of the eighth commandment.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

RATHER more than ten years ago there appeared the first part of a new German translation of the Old Testament. The authors were two well-known Jewish scholars, Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig, and the translation had several original features. The Divine name, for instance, was rendered by none of the traditional methods—'Lord,' 'The Eternal,' 'Yahweh'—but by the use of the pronoun of the third person, printed in capital letters. The text, even in prose portions, was arranged in lines of varying length, the verses being usually divided in accordance with the Massoretic accentuation. Attempts were made to use the same German word for each Hebrew root, and to show something of the primitive meaning of the root in the translation. These and other peculiarities in detail aroused a good deal of discussion, and the surviving translator, Buber, has now published a volume of essays and letters,¹ expounding the principles on which the translation was based, and answering some of his critics. The greater number of these must be ascribed to Buber himself, but there is enough of Rosenzweig's work to show that the two collaborators were in full harmony.

Translation is never easy; indeed, it may well be that the more the translator knows of the two languages concerned, the greater the difficulties appear to be. No consistent method of transferring thoughts from one tongue to another can succeed, since the area of meaning covered by a word in one language hardly ever coincides with that of any one word in another speech. It is, too, only occasionally that a word is well represented by the method of reproducing its root. Sacrificial terms derived from the root QRB may occasionally be rendered by words suggesting proximity; readers of Gray's 'Sacrifice in the Old Testament' will recall his use of the word 'present.' But it may be doubted whether any vestige of the idea of 'ascent' (if that be really the meaning of the root) is retained in the word rendered as 'burnt-offering' in E.VV. Often, too, the thought is better represented by a free translation or a paraphrase. Buber himself, to take a single case, points out (p. 303) the ambiguity of the Hebrew *qol* (voice or

sound) in Gn 3⁸. He might have added numerous other references. As a matter of fact the presence of the word is due to the Hebrew preference for complete and concrete expressions. It says 'anoint with the oil of gladness,' where we should naturally say 'anoint with gladness,' and in Gn 3⁸ the meaning of the writer is best expressed by saying simply '... heard Yahweh walking in the garden.' Again, the Hebrew 'Infinitive Absolute' has never been satisfactorily translated, and probably never will be. In general it may be said that the difficulty of finding renderings which shall be accurate in detail is so great, that it is simpler for people of average intelligence to learn Hebrew.

There are some interesting essays on Hebrew style, prose rhythm, and 'thought-shape,' while the rendering of the Tetragrammaton, already mentioned, is discussed more than once. The book is scholarly and interesting, but it leaves the impression that the new version is less successful than some of its predecessors, especially that of Luther.

Professor Johannes Hempel's *Gott und Mensch im Alten Testament* has been recognized as a work of outstanding importance and of permanent value, ever since it was first published, and no student of Old Testament theology can fail to note its influence on those scholars who have dealt seriously with the subject during the last ten years. The new edition of the book² has been much needed, since the first was exhausted four years ago, and should secure a warm welcome. As we should expect of the author, full use has been made of all that has appeared in the interval between the two editions, and the book has been largely rewritten.

God afar, God at hand—that is the paradox of Old Testament religion, and the thread of this double conception runs through the whole of Israel's spiritual history. The first reaction of the Hebrew mind to God is an awe, almost a terror, of the 'numinous.' Men seek to protect themselves against the peril of the Unseen, enhanced as it is by the growing conception of Yahweh's proximity to Israel, till they find in Him a possible friend as well as a possible foe, and at length reach a faith like that expressed in such lines as

Fear Him, ye saints, and you will then
Have nothing else to fear.

² Kohlhammer, Stuttgart; R.M.15.

¹ Martin Buber and Frank Rosenzweig, *Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung* (Schocken Verlag, Berlin, 1936).

An analysis of the grounds on which the trustful awe of Israel is based leads us into various modes of Divine self-revelation. God is seen in history (as has been well said, 'History is the sacrament of the Hebrews') and in Nature, in Yahweh's power as a warrior-God and in that absolute control over the material universe which is so often exhibited (to the Hebrew mind) in miracle. The settlement in Palestine, involving a transition to agricultural life and the acceptance (with striking modifications) of certain widespread theories of creation, strongly affected Israel's beliefs without eliminating the primary motifs. Especially in the experience of the prophets, with its sense of Divine compulsion and its stress on Yahweh's holiness, Israel was constantly reminded of the nearness of God. The realization of His close relation to His people found expression in the idea of the Covenant, and is apparent, both in the metaphors used by Old Testament writers, and in the modes of address employed in prayer. Finally, the bearing of the Israelite conception of God on the religious life of the individual is emphasized and developed. Hempel rightly insists that there always was a place for the single personality in religion, though it attained full recognition only in Jeremiah. Yahweh alone controls the fortunes of man, and it was to Him that the Israelite appealed in the great crises of life, while the moral standard of Israel is based less on the logical development of a pure ethic than on the demand for personal obedience to the dominant will of God.

Hempel has not attempted a full theology of the Old Testament, yet the ground he covers is so wide that in many cases detailed discussion is impossible. To the conception of Yahweh as a war-God, for instance, he might have added some account of the battle-panic through which victories were won. The last section of all, on the demands of Yahweh, gives no detailed account of the moral standard required. Indeed, Hempel has deliberately excluded such a discussion from the present work, with the more reason, since he has developed the theme elsewhere—in his *Ethos des Alten Testaments*. But the reader will find here a starting-point from which many lines of thought open up, and there is hardly a page which lacks suggestive and even challenging statement. Once again, we cannot but thank Professor Hempel for revising and re-issuing one of the most valuable of modern books on the Old Testament.

great Commentary¹ on Jeremiah, of which a third edition has recently appeared. The main features of the edition of 1920 are retained, especially the divisions of the book and its strophic arrangement. An original translation of each section is accompanied by textual notes, with an occasional explanatory comment, and followed by an historical and critical discussion. Full use is made of earlier writers; especially valuable are the citations from patristic commentaries—a subject too often neglected by Protestant scholars. There is a marked and welcome freedom from sectarian and theological bias, and authors like Calvin and Luther are treated on their merits as scholars. While Père Condamin is cautious, both in textual and in higher criticism, he is entirely free from obscurantism. He handles some of his predecessors, especially Duhm, somewhat severely, but he is far from unique in this respect; of all modern commentators, it is interesting to observe, Peake most often finds favour. On every page there is evidence of sound and rich Hebrew learning, while both the Vulgate and the LXX are constantly cited.

The book is thus a monument of high scholarship. But it is the scholarship of a past generation. Condamin's strophic theory is a modified form of D. H. Müller's—surely the least satisfactory account of Hebrew poetic form that the modern world has seen. True, some of Müller's grosser enormities are avoided (Condamin usually, though not always, makes a sound distinction between prose and poetry), but we have many of the same trivial and accidental repetitions of words, often forming no part of the real poetic structure, elevated into determining features of the verse form. One of the results is the frequent necessity for arbitrary transposition and modification of the text which Condamin would have been the first to condemn if they had been made in the interests of any other theory.

The higher criticism, too, belongs to a bygone stage of studies in the Prophets. Condamin rightly condemns Duhm's *critique chirurgicale*, and devotes an unnecessary amount of space to the refutation, often justifiably scornful, of Duhm's theories. But he does not see that these theories are simply the *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole method of approach. As long as scholars thought of the prophetic books as having been written substantially in their present form by definite authors, and merely exposed to redactional interpolation, the door

¹ *Le Livre de Jérémie*, by C. P. Albert Condamin, de la Compagnie de Jésus; troisième édition corrigée (Librairie Lecoffre, Paris).

One of the most important of modern Roman Catholic works on the Old Testament is Condamin's

was left open to unlimited subjectivity. The newer school, at which Condamin barely glances, is not wholly free from this danger but reduces it to much narrower limits, and has largely eliminated the need for assuming deliberate insertions in an existing 'book.' Condamin's arguments against Duhm, Cornill, and others are usually cogent, but they are a waste of time, since the basic theory on which both sides seem to rest can no longer be held valid.

More than any other book in the Old Testament (except Hosea and Job), Jeremiah demands for its interpretation deep human sympathy and spiritual insight. It is just here that Condamin, with all his rich learning and sane judgment, tends to be least satisfactory. Duhm made some appalling blunders—to-day we all admit the fact—but he did make an effort, not unsuccessfully, to penetrate the secrets of Jeremiah's soul, to see what he saw, to feel what he felt, and so to translate into modern terms the eternal message of which the prophet was the reluctant bearer. We may compare, again, Condamin's scanty note on Jer 8⁷

with Cornill's magnificent comment (almost a sermon) on the verse. His exposition of Jer 20^{7a} is nearer to what we instinctively demand, but he has failed to note the full significance of the 'seduction' of the prophet, so well brought out by Volz in his second edition. Incidentally, the general neglect of Volz is remarkable, in view of the careful attention given to so many other writers.

Such a result is perhaps inevitable; only a completely new commentary would meet the demands of the situation. Though so much of what was done on Jeremiah in the last generation has been superseded, the older school did produce a number of fine pieces of scholarship, and Père Condamin's commentary must take high rank among them. It is well that men of the younger school should be once more reminded of the conscientiousness and high standard of accurate learning exhibited by their predecessors.

T. H. ROBINSON.

Cardiff.

Contributions and Comments.

'The kingdom of God has come.'

Two of our most distinguished New Testament scholars have recently stated their approval of the view that the familiar words in Mk 1¹⁵, ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, do not mean 'The kingdom of God is at hand,' but rather, 'The kingdom of God has come.' Professor R. H. Lightfoot of Oxford says only that this is 'probably' the meaning, and that 'so we are now often bidden by good guides to understand . . . the words' (v. his Bampton Lectures, *History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, 107, n. 1, and 65). Professor C. H. Dodd, now of Cambridge, in his most interesting and stimulating book, *The Parables of the Kingdom*, asserts without qualification that this is the meaning, and gives the argument for it. 'In the LXX,' he says, 'the perfect of the verb ἡγγίζειν is used to translate the Hebrew verb *naga'* and the Aramaic verb *m'ta*, both of which mean "to reach," "to arrive." The same two verbs are also translated by the aorist of the verb φθάνειν, which is used in Mt 12²⁸; Lk 11²⁰. It would appear therefore that no

difference of meaning is intended between ἐφάσεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, and ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Both imply the "arrival" of something which has hitherto been the object of expectation. We should translate both: "The Kingdom of God has come"' (*op. cit.*, 44). This argument is of course not new; Professor Dodd himself has used it, in print, at least twice before (see *Theology*, May 1927, p. 259, and *Mysterium Christi* (1930), 67, n. 1). But the fuller and more confident statement of it which he has now given makes it desirable to examine carefully the evidence upon which it is based, especially since many of his readers will not be in a position to do so for themselves.

There are only seven certain occurrences of the perfect of the verb ἡγγίζειν in the LXX.¹ In none of these does it translate either *naga'* or *m'ta*; in all the six instances where the Hebrew is extant it translates some form of the root *qarab*, which means 'to come near, to approach.' In Jer 51⁹ (LXX 28⁹), where the Hebrew is *naga'*, the Vatican

¹ The figures for the LXX throughout are based on the concordance of Hatch and Redpath.

manuscript (B) has the perfect, but the Sinaitic (S) and Alexandrine (A) manuscripts have the aorist. The aorist has internal probability in its favour, since the verb in the parallel clause is in the aorist, and has the support of Rahlfs in his recent edition of the LXX.

Other tenses of ἐγγίζειν are used to translate *naga'* seven times. But one of the meanings of *naga'* is 'to come near.' This is certainly the meaning in three out of the seven passages (Ps 88³ 107¹⁸, Sir 51⁶), and in three others it is at the least quite possible (Ps 32⁶, Jer 51⁹, Sir 37³⁰). In one passage only the meaning must be 'reached,' Jon 3⁶, 'The tidings reached the king.' This might be regarded as a mere translator's blunder, if it were not that there is an almost exactly similar use of the word in 1 Mac 3²⁶, where the R.V., strangely enough, renders literally, 'His name came near even unto the king.'

Twice ἐγγίζειν is used (but not in the perfect) where the original has the Aramaic verb *m'ta* (Dn 4^{11.22}). In this passage the LXX diverges greatly from the Massoretic Text, and whatever may be the exact meaning of the latter, it is not clear that the translator meant by ἐγγίζειν anything more than 'come near to.' If one wishes to indicate that a tree was of enormous size it matters little whether it is said to have reached to heaven or only to have come close to heaven.

Altogether ἐγγίζειν is used in the LXX one hundred and fifty-eight times, and though the original is not always extant, in one hundred and ten of these it translates either *qarab* or *nagas*, both of which mean 'to come near.'

It is clear that the LXX affords no good evidence that ἤγγικεν ever means 'has come,' for, however they are to be explained, the two instances in which the aorist is used of news reaching a king can hardly be regarded as justifying this conclusion.

Moreover, the evidence of the NT itself must be taken into account. Apart from those passages in the Gospels which refer to the Kingdom of God, ἤγγικεν occurs seven times; three times it cannot mean anything else than 'has come near, is at hand' (Ro 13¹², Ja 5⁸, 1 P 4⁷), and in the other four there is no reason to suppose that it means anything else (Mt 26^{45.46}, Lk 21^{8.20}).

Further, according to Mt 3², John the Baptist as well as Jesus announced ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. It may well be that Matthew mistakenly attributed the words to Him, as Professor Dodd believes (p. 48, n. 1). But even so, the mistake proves that for Matthew they meant only, 'The

Kingdom of God has come near,' for he certainly did not believe that the Kingdom had come with John.

But if the evidence of the LXX does not justify any change in the usual translation of ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, it does raise doubts whether ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ really means, 'The kingdom of God has come to you.' The aorist indicative of φθάνειν occurs some fourteen times in the LXX. Twice it translates *naga'* (Ezr 3¹, Neh 7⁷² [78] = 2 Es 3¹ 17⁷³). In both passages the context makes it clear that the meaning cannot be, 'When the seventh month was come' (A.V. and R.V.), unless we are to suppose an incredible amount of activity in the early hours of the first day of that month. The meaning plainly is, 'When the seventh month drew near.' Eight times it translates *m'ta*, all in 'Theodotion's' version of Daniel, but with a notable variety of meanings—'reached' (6²⁵); 'came to' (7¹³); 'came,' of a particular time (7²²); 'reached (to heaven)'—or, possibly, 'came close (to heaven)'—without any suggestion of motion towards heaven (4¹¹ 20²³); and 'befell' (4^{24.28}). In Jg 20⁴², where the Hebrew verb is *dabaq*, it apparently means 'followed hard after' (R.V.; cf. Vulg., eos adversariis persequentibus). The present tense has much the same sense in v.³⁴ of the same chapter, where the Hebrew verb is *naga'*. And in Dn 8⁷, where the Hebrew means explicitly 'coming close to,' Theodotion has φθάνοντα ἔως.

This brief review of the LXX evidence shows that 'to reach, to arrive (at)' is not the only meaning of φθάνειν in Hellenistic Greek—if that needed to be shown. So it must not be simply taken for granted that ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ means, 'The kingdom of God has come to you.' φθάνειν may have the meaning which it has in Jg 20^{34.42}, Dn 8⁷, 2 Es 3¹ 17⁷³, and the aorist may be best represented by an English perfect; the meaning will then be, 'The kingdom of God has come close upon you.' But there is another possibility. The aorist here—which deserves more attention than it has received—may be a 'timeless' aorist with a future reference (cf. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*,² 846 f.), and the meaning will then be, 'The kingdom of God will be upon you immediately.' It happens that there is another instance of ἐφθασεν in the NT which almost demands this interpretation—1 Th 2¹⁶, ἐφθασεν δὲ ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος. How could Paul, writing about A.D. 50, say that the divine wrath had already come upon the Jews? But if he meant only that it would come upon them immediately there is no difficulty. And there is one passage in the LXX where this interpretation also seems to

give the best sense—Dn 4²⁴, 'It is the decree of the Most High, which ἐφθασεν upon my lord the king.' This may perhaps mean that the decree has already come upon the king, but it would be more natural to say, 'which is about to come upon my lord the king,' especially since the divine judgment is actually pronounced by a voice from heaven twelve months later, and is then fulfilled at once upon him. There would seem to be no reason why the Aramaic should not be translated in that way; Moffatt renders it, 'which befalls my lord the king,' and Ostervald, 'qui va atteindre le roi, mon seigneur.' It is very possible that whoever translated the saying of Jesus into Greek did not distinguish between these two possible ways of interpreting his rendering, since either way the result is practically the same.

Here a remark upon an interesting modern Greek use of the aorist of φθάνειν is in place. Surely when a Greek waiter says, ἐφθασα, κύριε!, he does not mean, 'Here I am, sir!' (Dodd, 43, n. 1), but, 'Just coming, sir!' (So Luce, *Cambridge Greek Testament*, St. Luke, note on 11²⁰. This agrees with my own information, and is also the natural interpretation of Moulton's note, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, i. 247.)

Whatever the real meaning of ἐφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ may be, at least it is plain that Professor Dodd has no reason for claiming it as an unequivocal statement that the Kingdom has come (p. 53; cf. *Theology*, May 1927, p. 259), or for being caustic about those who 'slip out of the difficulty by reading ἐφθασεν as if it were μόνον οὐκ ἐφθασεν, a perfectly good idiom which might have been used if this had been the meaning intended' (p. 75, n. 1).

Professor Lightfoot, who refers to this question only incidentally, remarks that 'from the evangelist's point of view' the conception of the Kingdom of God as actually present 'would not necessarily seem inconsistent with the counter conception expressed in such passages as 9¹ 13²⁶ 14²⁵—a difficult statement, which we wish he had explained. Professor Dodd apparently rejects Mk 13²⁶ (v. p. 83 f.), and explains Mk 14²⁵, along with Mt 8¹¹, and the parallel in Lk 13^{28f.}, as meaning that 'at some date in the future the present earthly manifestation of the Kingdom of God will yield to a purely transcendent order in which it will be absolute' (p. 55 f.). But he maintains that Mk 9¹ in no way conflicts with the conception of the Kingdom as already present. He translates, 'There are some of those standing here who will not taste death until they have seen that the Kingdom of God has come with power,' and explains in a note,

'The construction of the accusative and participle in the sense of the accusative and infinitive with verbs dicendi [*cognoscendi*] et sentiendi is known to every schoolboy; and the perfect participle indicates an action already complete from the standpoint of the subject of the main verb. There is therefore no doubt that the correct translation of the Greek is as given above. The bystanders are not promised that they shall see the Kingdom of God coming, but that they shall come to see that the Kingdom of God has already come, at some point before they became aware of it' (p. 53, n. 1).

It is difficult to take seriously the suggestion that this passage has been persistently mistranslated because the translators were ignorant or forgetful of the meaning of a construction known to every schoolboy. It is to be hoped that every schoolboy knows also that the accusative and participle with verbs of knowing and perceiving is not necessarily, or even usually, to be translated by a noun clause in English. Take the sentence, 'He saw Simon and Andrew casting nets' (Mk 1¹⁶). This is an exact translation of the Greek. Neither in English nor in Greek is it possible to determine, merely from the grammar, whether the meaning is, 'He saw that Simon and Andrew were casting nets,' or, 'He saw Simon and Andrew, who were casting nets.' It is the context which makes it certain that here the latter is the meaning. Now in the first three Gospels this construction is used with the verb ἵδεν alone no fewer than thirty-six times, yet there is perhaps only one instance in which it is clear that there is sufficient emphasis on the participle to warrant the use of a noun clause in English—Mt 25³⁷ (and 44), 'When did we see you hungering?'—that is, 'that you were hungering?' Even here the quite literal translation is probably preferable.

This alone would suffice to make Professor Dodd's translation highly improbable, but there is another consideration which is conclusive against it. On that translation ἵδεν here means, 'to perceive mentally, to recognize' the real significance of something actually 'seen' long before. Whenever in the NT ἵδεν has this sense, the fact recognized is expressed in a ὅτι clause (v. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*,² 1041). A ὅτι clause may be used even when real seeing accompanies and occasions intellectual perception; there are three examples of this in Mk 2¹⁶ (where a variant reading gives the participial construction) 9²⁵ 15³⁹. But in the first three Gospels and Acts I have not been able to find any example of the use of the participle when ἵδεν is used of intellectual perception only; in the ten instances in which this

is the meaning a *ἔτι* clause is used (Mt 2¹⁶ 27³ 27²⁴, Mk 12²⁴, Lk 8⁴⁷ 17¹⁵, Ac 8¹⁸ 12³ 14⁹ 16⁹; cf. also Gal 2⁷⁻¹⁴, Rev 12¹³).

Lastly, is it certain that the perfect participle here indicates an action already complete from the standpoint of the subject of the main verb? Most recent translators render it by a present, notably

both Wellhausen and Torrey, who may be supposed to have had the probable Aramaic original in mind.

J. Y. CAMPBELL.

Kilmacolin.

[Professor C. H. Dodd will comment next month on the points raised by Mr. Campbell.—EDITOR.]

Entre Nous.

Aldous Huxley.

Tarred and feathered from barrels and hen roosts of conventional piety, Aldous Huxley found his earlier public mainly among young and unprejudiced thinkers, who still saw the angel behind the tar. One could understand the Church's distaste. There was, and is, a Biblical frankness about his treatment of a certain strata of contemporary society, which we do not easily tolerate outside the sacred page.

But now, like a fair tree from a sodden root, has emerged, in *Eyeless in Gaza*, a great writer, one of the most significant of our time. The value of a novel might be tested by its capacity to endow those who read it with a sharper command of their course. And no one who reads this book with understanding but must find the problems of peace and liberty and social justice, so particular to our generation, more navigable than before.

Why the title? We do not know. Unless it is the ubiquitous Eye of Time which has been taken out of its customary socket while the book was in the making. Its pages remind us of those old Japanese scrolls which must be regarded not horizontally, like other pictures, but from above. The narrative is not continuous, but flits to and fro from year to year, as if an onlooker from a great height were darting his eyes hither and thither over the outspread scroll of the hero's life, and were seeing it rather as pattern than as continuity, time itself as a pattern, weaving in and out amid persons and emotions and events. By this technique the writer does achieve what he seeks, a vision of life as unity. 'He was committed to them, as a hand is committed to the arm. Committed to his friends, committed even to those who had declared themselves his enemies. There was nothing he could do but would affect them all, enemies and friends alike—for good, if what he did were good, for evil if it were wrong . . . physical unity first of

all. Unity even in diversity, even in separation. Separate patterns, but everywhere alike.' . . . 'And minds—minds also are unique, but unique above a substratum of mental identity. Identity and interchangeableness of love, trust, courage. Fearless affection restores the lunatic to sanity, transforms the hostile savage into a friend, tames the wild animal. The mental pattern of love can be transferred from one mind to another and still retain its virtue, just as the physical pattern of a hormone can be transferred, with all its effectiveness, from one body to another.

'And not only love, but hate as well; not only trust but greed and suspicion; not only kindness, generosity, courage, but also malevolence and greed and fear.'

'Evil is the accentuation of division; good, whatever makes for unity with other lives and other beings.'

Yet there remains the inescapable paradox that diversity and separations are the conditions of our existence, even while they are in themselves evil. Evil, Huxley believes, 'is the condition of life, the condition of being aware of knowing what is good and beautiful.' 'Even for the highest goodness the struggle is without end; for never in the nature of present things can the shut become wholly open; goodness can never free itself completely from evil.'

The climax and conclusion of the book is on a very high level, but there is not space here for more than its opening sentences. 'Meanwhile there are love and compassion. Constantly obstructed. But, oh, let be made indefatigable, implacable to surmount all obstacles, the inner sloth, the distaste, the intellectual scorn; and, from without, the other's aversions and suspicions. Affection, compassion—and also, meanwhile, this contemplative approach, this effort to realize the unity of lives and beings with the intellect, and at last, perhaps, intuitively

an act of complete understanding. . . . For beneath all being, beneath the countless identical but separate patterns, beneath the attractions and repulsions, lies peace. . . . Dark peace, immeasurably deep. Peace from pride and hatred and anger, peace from cravings and aversions, peace from all the separating frenzies. Peace through liberation, for peace is achieved freedom. Freedom and at the same time truth. The truth of unity actually experienced. Peace in the depths, under the storm, far down below the leaping of the waves, the frantically flying spray.'

Besides the hero, Antony Beavis, who has, we fancy, more than a dash of Julian Huxley in his composition, there is Miller the anthropologist, and the most entirely satisfactory pacifist in fiction which we have so far discovered. He has come to his pacifism through his contacts with other civilizations, in the course of his anthropological researches. 'Savage societies are simply civilised societies on a small scale with the lid off. We can learn to understand them fairly easily. And when we've learnt to understand savages, we've learnt, as we discover, to understand the civilised. . . . And that's not all. Savages are usually hostile and suspicious. The anthropologist has got to learn to overcome that hostility and superstition. And when he's learnt that, he's learnt the whole secret of politics.'

'Which is . . . ?'

'That if you treat other people well, they'll treat you well.'

'You're a bit optimistic, aren't you?'

'No. In the long run they'll always treat you well.' . . . 'If one looks for men, one finds them. Very decent ones, in a majority of cases. Go among a suspicious badly treated savage people, go unarmed, with your hands open. Go with the persistent and obstinate intention of doing them some good—curing their sick for example.'

If there were ever any committees who felt justified in excluding Aldous Huxley's books from theological libraries where young divinity students forgather, it is now time for them to reconsider their scruples. The greatest men are the most normal, and their moral pilgrimage rises from greater depths to greater heights than those of vaguer and less defined souls. If the younger Huxley struggled once in the primæval slime, he is wiser now, and those that would hear him must lift their faces to the wind.

EDITH ANNE ROBERTSON.

Aberdeen.

Witnessing.

'The human heart and mind,' said Mr. Studdert Kennedy, 'move to truth through trouble.' The life of Mr. Stuart Wood is a striking illustration of these words. We know the earlier part of his story—he told it in 'Glorious Liberty.' In the sequel, *Strange Triumph* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), Mr. Wood compares himself to Rashkolnikoff in Dostoevsky's 'Crime and Punishment,' but says humbly, 'Rashkolnikoff had committed but one crime under the pressure of extreme poverty . . . whereas I found God and was found by Him not at the beginning of a life of crime and punishment, but at the end of it.' But for him, as for Dostoevsky's character 'a new history commences; a story of the gradual renewing of a man, of his slow, progressive regeneration, and change from one world to another—an introduction to the hitherto unknown realities of life.'

Mr. Wood wrote *Strange Triumph* under the compulsion of his own strong feeling that men want a personal witness. They are not impressed by what is second-hand. And so if a man has 'an experiential certainty wrested from the circumstances of life' he must witness. In three years Mr. Wood has preached to over 50,000 and 'been the instrument through whom a fair number of defeated souls have resolved to follow Jesus Christ.' But his witness was not effective until he learned to strip himself of conventional self-respect. 'I asked,' he says, 'a reporter if he could not tone down the emphasis on the past and put it on the present work I was trying to do.' That stage passed, and now he willingly adopts the rôle of guide through the far country.

Yes, thou forgivest, but with all forgiving

Can'st not renew mine innocence again:

Make thou, O Christ, a dying of my living,

Purge from the sin but never from the pain!

Religion.

'All religion worthy of the name is experimental religion. . . . All Church organizations should maintain experiment stations devoted to research into the fundamental questions of religion—God, prayer, faith, guidance, immortality. Each believer should be such a laboratory.'

'The essence of this life is faith. Faith that the universe is so put together and so controlled that all things, the human spirit included, are always being acted upon by forces whose resultant is providence, progress, evolution, the Will of God. . . . To find out the directions of that Will, both

collectively and individually, and then by faith to risk all upon our belief in the validity of our spiritual judgments, is to see and love and follow God. This is perfect religion. . . . The test of its validity is in its results. Within, courage replaces fear, conviction replaces doubt, happiness replaces anxiety. Without, order replaces chaos, love replaces hatred, good replaces evil, righteousness replaces sin, success replaces failure.' ¹

Sympathy.

'Even more poignant a memory . . . is that of an old man, bowed and grey, sitting hopelessly on a block of stone in the same yard (the hospital exercise yard at Parkhurst convict prison). A man of good birth, breeding and culture, a former magistrate and Deputy Lord-Lieutenant of a county. With tears slowly trickling down his aged cheeks he gazes fixedly at the palm of his hand. For on his palm lies a dead mouse—his cell pet and only friend. And then I saw Jesus in the hideous garb of the prison—an old Cockney burglar with many convictions—go up to the weeping man and heard him say: "Don't cry, old 'un, 'ere's anuver mahse ter take 'is place." As he spoke he dived his hand into the inside of his shirt and fished out a little flannel bag in which there was a tame field-mouse. That was *his* pet and pal.' ²

Christianity and War.

'Christianity,' the Archbishop of York writes, 'gives no grounds for affirming that the psychological life of a human being is sacrosanct. If it were, it would always be wrong to surrender it in martyrdom. . . .

'The real evil is always the curtailment of liberty—the overriding of personal choice. To take life is to do this in the most absolute and final way; whereas to give life for a cause is the supreme manifestation of liberty, the fullest exercise of personal choice. Taking life should be the very last resort; but justice is more sacred than life.

'There is one really strong argument against the use of armed force; it is that none of us are good enough to use it without moral deterioration. As soon as fighting begins, passions are released which strangle high aspirations, and the spirit of truth is stifled in the hearts of men. Yet I cannot hold that this is a valid reason for refusing the perilous duty; it is a cogent reason for spiritual discipline in preparation for it.

'Why, then, did Christ not fight nor suffer His

¹ Stuart Wood, *Strange Triumph*, 267.

² *Ibid.*, 27.

followers to fight for His kingdom? He gave the answer to Pilate. If His kingdom were one of this world's kingdoms, His servants would fight for it, for *their* heritage and treasure is temporal, and such as may be destroyed by conquest or loss of autonomy or preserved by successful armed resistance. But His kingdom is spiritual; its essence is that Truth to which He bears witness. To fight for that is to betray it, for it only wins victories where surrender to it is free.

'Thus the Christian may fight to preserve his country from invasion, or to uphold defined justice among the nations with which his own is in contractual relations; but he must not fight for his Faith, nor to defend his life when that is threatened because he is a witness to that Faith; for to fight the Faith otherwise than by argument and by appeal is to betray it.' ¹

This Incredible World.

'There is really nothing in the modern view of the physical universe which should make it more difficult than formerly to believe in man's spiritual worth and destiny. The Christian hope has always been a daring, even an incredible hope. But then the actual itself is incredible.

'The whole structure of this mysterious universe and the conditions of man's physical life within it, as presented by modern science, must be counted incredible. Is it not incredible that the terrific forces and velocities of the atom should be fitted together to make the quiet beauty of the countryside, or that we ourselves, compounded of these same forces and velocities, should so peacefully live and work and sleep?

'In such an incredible world as this, and with the limited knowledge that we possess, it is folly to reject any experience simply because it seems incredible. Rather may we have courage to believe that, as the present world would have been counted incredible, if it had not been experienced, so there may be realms of reality yet to be disclosed surpassing all human imagination.' ²

¹ *Christianity in Thought and Practice*.

² J. H. Morrison, *Christian Faith and the Science of To-Day*.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.